

The Catholic Educational Review

MARCH, 1934

THE CHILD LABOR AMENDMENT

I

Twice the Congress of the United States enacted statutes regulating the labor of children, and twice the Supreme Court of the United States denied such authority to the federal legislature. The law of 1916, passed under the commerce clause of the Constitution, was annulled in 1918, while the law of 1919, passed under the taxing power, was declared unconstitutional in 1922. It was not long before the Congress initiated an amendment to the Constitution proposing the desired extension of its sphere. The amendment, having once failed of ratification, is again being widely discussed, since some states have exercised the supposed privilege of reconsidering rejection. There is at present perhaps no topic more timely or important before the American people, unless it be the question of school support. The proposed amendment reads as follows:

"Section 1. The Congress shall have power to limit, regulate and prohibit the labor of persons under eighteen years of age.

"Section 2. The power of the several States is unimpaired by this article except that the operation of State laws shall be suspended to the extent necessary to give effect to legislation enacted by the Congress."

Here is a definite attempt to add a new element to the Constitution; here is a willingness to make a grant of vast, unheard-of powers to the Congress; here is a proposal to effect a substantial change in the very relations between the Federal Government and the States. It is a matter of prime magnitude and incalculable consequence.

II

It is unnecessary to undertake to answer all the arguments that are current in favor of the amendment or to advance all the

arguments that might be marshaled against it. For in the heat of debate many words are wasted, even as mountains of ammunition are squandered in the dust of battle. And even as an armed conflict is decided by a few strategic moves, so in every great question a few principles determine whether the cause shall stand or fall. Convinced of the fundamental unsoundness and the potential danger of this amendment, I assert at the outset that it ought not to pass.

First, let me make clear that in my opinion, some objections to the amendment can be discounted and some fears of it are unjustified.

The amendment, although a radical departure, is not socialistic or communistic in origin or intent.

By the word *labor* is obviously meant what ordinary usage implies in the phrase *child labor*; it means generally, work in factories and on farms, in stores and on the streets; it does not include study or "homework," or any of the common processes and practices of education. I do not admit, however, that the amendment would not interfere at all with education.

It is not sensible to suppose that the Congress would, at the earliest opportunity, legislate to the very limit of its new grant of power, and send a force of federal agents swarming over the land, to snoop and spy and meddle—to invade every private domain and violate personal rights at will.

But more admissions are in order, for the sake of the record.

Child labor has in fact been an acute problem prevailing in practically all parts of the country. It is a problem demanding the attention of every enlightened citizen.

Much of child labor is, of course, detrimental, and the labor of children of tender age should be gradually abolished in some manner.

The States have the right and, indeed, the duty to regulate child labor. State laws in many cases are inadequate and enforcement in more cases is feeble. But let us reflect that merely because an agency, in its own proper sphere, fails to perform its obligatory functions, we are not warranted to deprive it of its functions, to relieve it of its responsibility and to transfer the right and the task where they do not belong, without having first made every effort to remedy the wrong at its source.

That is a reprehensible species of dodging the real issue; worse still: it is an attempt to cure one evil by another.

It is reactionary and unreasonable as well as futile and foolish to hold that the Constitution should not from time to time be reinterpreted and even expanded. As Chief Justice Hughes says in the recent momentous Minnesota Mortgage Moratorium Case: "If by the statement that what the Constitution meant at the time of its adoption it means today, it is intended to say that the great clauses of the Constitution must be confined to the interpretation which the framers, with the conditions and outlook of their time, would have placed upon them, the statement carries its own refutation. It was to guard against such a narrow conception that Chief Justice Marshall uttered the memorable warning—'We must never forget that it is a *constitution* we are expounding' (*McCulloch v. Maryland*, 4 Wheat. 316, 407)—'a constitution intended to endure for ages to come, and, consequently, to be adapted to the various *crises* of human affairs.' *Id.*, p. 415." Very true. But in the case of this amendment we are dealing with a limitation of liberty and an assumption of power not only not contemplated by the founders but so novel and extensive as to arouse the apprehension that it signifies the beginning of a re-formation of American government.

And now for the denials. I deny that all forms of child labor are undesirable; that the State must legislate by *compulsory* and *prohibitive* measures to insure recreational and cultural advantages for children beyond the bounds of necessity; that the individual States are unable to cope with the problem of child labor; that uniform child labor laws are necessary or desirable; that the amendment is not an invasion of State rights; that the federal control as authorized would not mean increased centralization and bureaucracy, that it would have nothing to do with education, and that it would not interfere with the family.

I wish also to deny (the denial itself is superfluous in view of the nature of my argument, even although there is no desire to confer excessive power) that it is necessary to confer upon the Congress the power to *prohibit* as well as the power to limit and regulate the labor of persons under eighteen. I would use this opportunity to make a pertinent and an important note. In dissenting from the decision in the first Child Labor Case (*Hammer v. Dagenhart*, 247 U. S. 251), Mr. Justice Holmes ob-

served that the power to regulate includes the power to prohibit. It does. But surely regulation and prohibition are not synonymous. Surely the power to regulate does not imply the power of arbitrary and comprehensive prevention, or of indiscriminate and summary destruction. The power to regulate employment agencies does not include the power to wipe out any and all such agencies; the power to regulate teaching does not include the power to prevent every teacher whatsoever from exercising a specific calling that is in itself useful and honorable; and the power to regulate child labor can not conceivably include the power to prohibit all labor, wholesome and hazardous, profitable and oppressive alike, and to prohibit it to all children—the tender and the maturing, the bright and the dull, the good and the delinquent, the widow's sole support and the well-to-do family's adopted daughter. The contention here simply is that an express power to prohibit opens the way to abuse, as was flagrantly the case with respect to the XVIIIth Amendment. One prohibition leads to another. It is the Prohibition philosophy. Mr. Justice Holmes, in the same dissenting opinion just quoted, said: "It is not for this court to say that it (prohibition) is permissible as against strong drink but not as against the product of ruined lives."

III

In offering my principal arguments against the Child Labor Amendment, I shall confine myself to the question of the extension of government authority in general and Federal authority in particular, and to the question of the infringement of personal liberties.

1. *The regulation and prohibition of the labor of children is not a Federal concern. Authority conferred upon the Congress by the general welfare clause of the Constitution is clearly limited and absolutely excludes the domain of labor.*

In reporting the Child Labor Amendment out of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate in 1924, Mr. Shortridge said:

"It cannot be questioned but that it is a paramount duty of government to guard and protect the welfare of its children to the end that they may have the utmost opportunity possible to attain the maximum development of their moral, intellectual,

and physical beings. This is manifestly the due of all children, since they are brought into the world without their volition, entirely helpless and dependent. But this is not alone simple justice to childhood. It is also of the greatest importance to every State that its citizens should attain the highest development above indicated. And it may be observed that while under our dual system of government the power and duty to make adequate provision by law for the accomplishment of those most desirable ends is now vested in the several States, nevertheless, it is as important to the National Government as it is to the government of every State that its citizenry be afforded every opportunity for legitimate development and that such development should neither be stunted nor destroyed by a neglect to pass adequate laws for the protection of childhood."

This statement, though not original, is nevertheless startling. The Senator asserts that it is the *paramount duty* of Government to protect the welfare of *its children* to the extent that they be afforded the *utmost opportunity possible* to attain their *maximum* development. The Senator says this cannot be questioned. He insists that it is a matter of *simple justice* to childhood. It requires no authority to retort that this is simply not true. This is not true in any sound system of ethics. This is not true in universal jurisprudence. This is not Christian doctrine, and just as assuredly it is not American doctrine. The American States have no such concern and *a fortiori* the Federal government has not. We have an indication here to what extravagant lengths some responsible advocates of social legislation will allow themselves to go.

I think that Madison, than whom perhaps no man has known the Constitution better, exposed the recklessness of the sweeping claims that might with logic be made if "the general welfare" be given a broad interpretation for Federal purposes.

Speaking in the Congress on the Cod-fishery Bounty Bill, in February, 1792, Madison said:

"There are consequences still more extensive, which, as they follow clearly from the doctrine combated, must either be admitted, or the doctrine must be given up. If Congress can employ money indefinitely to the general welfare, and are the sole and supreme judges of the general welfare, they may take the care of religion into their own hands; they may appoint teachers in every State, county and parish, and pay them out of their public Treasury; they may take into their own hands the edu-

cation of children, establishing in like manner schools throughout the Union; they may assume the provision for the poor; they may undertake the regulation of all roads other than post-roads; in short, everything, from the highest object of State legislation down to the most minute object of police, would be thrown under the power of Congress; for every object I have mentioned would admit of the application of money, and might be called, if Congress pleased, provisions for the general welfare."

In spite of the partial success of the child labor amendment, the Supreme Court is still entitled to be heard on the principles involved. I quote from the opinions in the two cases that doomed the power of the Congress to legislate on child labor—*Hammer v. Dagenhart*, 247 U. S. 251, and *Baily v. Drexel*, 259 U. S. 20.

In the former case the court said:

"The far-reaching result of upholding the act cannot be more plainly indicated than by pointing out that if Congress can thus regulate matters entrusted to local authority by prohibition of the movement of commodities in interstate commerce, all freedom of commerce will be at an end, and the power of the States over local matters may be eliminated, and thus our system of government be practically destroyed."

And in the latter case the court said:

"The good sought in unconstitutional legislation is an insidious feature because it leads citizens and legislators of good purpose to promote it without thought of the serious breach it will make in the ark of our covenant or the harm which will come from breaking down recognized standards. In the maintenance of local self-government, on the one hand, and the national power on the other, our country has been able to endure and prosper for near a century and a half."

By way of emphasis I would repeat the warning of Chief Justice Taft, just cited. For it is fitting and proper—indeed, it is right and requisite for every legislator, every sociologist, every citizen to inquire and to ponder whither and how far this proposed departure from traditional doctrines and established standards may lead us, and how the operation of the new power may serve as inducement and authority for legislation of still greater scope, still more presumptuous character.

2. *The regulation and prohibition of the labor of minors easily may and often does actually interfere with parental rights, as these rights are understood in present American jurisprudence.*

Such interference may and does take place under State auspices. It would, a fortiori, take place under Federal auspices, for in this instance the greater may not even do that which the lesser may do.

What is the status briefly, of parental rights under American law? I note these rights because they are not generally understood, even by educated people, to be substantially established and guaranteed.

The parent, having generated the child, and having the duty to support him, has also the right to control his actions and to employ his services. *Cooley*, Constitutional Limitations (1868), 340. *Schouler*, Domestic Relations, no. 740. *Commonwealth v. Armstrong*, (1842), 1 Penna. L. J. 393. *Board of Education v. Purse*, (1897), 101 Ga. 422, 28 S. E. 896.

The parental power and authority of control are derived from a source anterior and superior to the State. They are founded on the natural law and are "an emanation from God." *Commonwealth v. Armstrong*, supra. *People v. Turner*, (1870), 55 Ill. 280, 8 Am. R. 645.

The parental right of control is a part of the liberty guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. *Meyer v. Nebraska*. (Foreign Language Case) (1923), 262 U. S. 390; *Pierce v. Society* (Oregon Case, 1925), 268 U. S. 534; *Farrington v. Tokushige* (Hawaii Japanese School Case), 273 U. S. 284.

The parent, when unduly deprived of the custody and control of his child, is deprived of property, in violation of constitutional law.

It is true that a child's person is not property in the ordinary legal sense. But the right of control is a property right. The child's right to work is property and therefore the parent's control over the child's labor is also property.

Consideration of this principle led *Tiedeman* to the following reflection:

"When the child is really able to provide for himself or herself, may the State impose upon the parent the duty to support the child during the time that the State requires the child to be in attendance upon the schools? This might very properly be considered a doubtful exercise of the police power. Still, if the education is necessary to make the child a valuable citizen, and can be made compulsory; as long as this requirement is kept within

the limits of necessity, it would seem that the maintenance of the child during its attendance upon the school would be as much the duty of the parent as to provide for the child's physical wants during its early infancy." *State and Federal Control of Persons and Property*, no. 199, (II, 933).

The right of civil authority to regulate all child labor and to prohibit some forms of it is not disputed. But parental rights must have prior consideration over public policy and the police power. There is a limit of reasonableness and a limit of necessity.

The fundamental principles underlying the State's action in the matter of child labor are the same as those underlying its action in the matter of education and custody. Custody implies education and occupation, while occupation and education presuppose custody. In the matter of custody the State may interfere only where it is necessary; it has no other warrant but necessity to interfere by compulsory measures in the matter of education and by prohibitive measures in the matter of child labor.

Story, Equity Jurisprudence, II, sec. 1341; *Kent*, Commentaries, II, 205; *Schouler*, Op. cit., No. 744; *People v. Turner*, supra; *Mill v. Brown*, 31 Utah 473, 88 Pac. 609; *Commonwealth v. Fisher*, 213 Pa. 48, 62 Atl. 198; *Ex parte Hoines* (N. J. Ch., 1920), 112 Atl. 613.

What the limits of reasonableness and of necessity are, is a question of fact, concerning which opinions may differ. With respect to any particular statute or any particular case, the ultimate decision of the question rests with the courts.

3. *The regulation and prohibition of child labor may and often does actually interfere with the rights of the child, as these rights are understood in present American jurisprudence.*

The child has a certain liberty of his own which is constitutionally guaranteed. The "natural and inalienable" rights guaranteed to "all men," are guaranteed to all men, women and children, though not in the same measure to all under all circumstances. *Tillman v. Tillman* (1910), 26 L.R.A. NS (S. C.) 781; *People v. Turner*, supra; *Pierce v. Society*, supra.

One of the specific constitutional rights of a minor is the right to work. This right may be immature and limited: but it surely exists, it grows wider and stronger as age advances, and in many instances it can be fully asserted.

This right was practically denied in *State v. Shorey* (another

Oregon case), 48 Ore. 396, 86 Pac. 881, the court holding that the State could exercise *unlimited control* over the actions, occupations and contracts of minors. But there are many cases to the contrary. The leading case is *People v. Ewer* (1892), 141 N. Y. 129, 36 N. E. 4.

Whether the child's liberty is unduly interfered with is here again a question of fact. The more legislation, the greater the danger of interference.

4. *The State has the right to regulate Child Labor only in respect to harmful or dangerous occupations, in respect to unduly long hours and up to reasonable ages. In every judicial case reported (as far as every effort can enable one to discover), in which the question of the constitutionality of child labor laws, on the score of liberty, was raised and decided in favor of the laws, the occupation was dangerous, or the hours were unduly long, or the child was of tender years.*

People v. Ewer (1892), 141 N. Y. 129, 25, 25 L. R. A. 794, 36 N. E. 4, 38 Am. St. Rep. 788. Exhibition of a child under fourteen as a dancer.

City of N. Y. v. Chelsea Jute Mills (1904), 88 N. Y. S. 1085, 43 Misc. Rep. 266. Child under fourteen.

State v. Shorey (1906), 48 Ore. 396, 86 Pac. 881, 24 L.R.A.N.S. 1121. Children under sixteen in certain callings more than ten hours a day.

Ex parte Spencer (1906), 149 Cal. 396, 86 Pac. 896, 9 Ann. Cas. 1105, 117 Am. St. Rep. 137. No child under fourteen in certain occupations, and no child under sixteen during school hours, if unable to read and write English.

Ex parte Weber (1906), 149 Cal. 392, 86 Pac. 909. Child under sixteen in injurious and dangerous occupation.

Lenahan v. Pittston (1907), 218 Pa. 311, 12 L. R. A. N. S. 461, 67 Atl. 642, 120 Am. St. Rep. 885. Child under fifteen oiling machinery in a coal mine.

Bryant v. Skillman (1908), 76 N. J. L. 45, 69 Atl. 23. Child under fourteen in manufacturing establishment.

Starnes v. Albion Mfg. Co. (1908), 147 N. C. 556, 61 S. E. 525, 17 L. R. A. N. S. 602, 15 Ann. Cas. 470. Child under twelve in manufacturing establishment.

Stehle v. Jaeger (1908), 220 Pa. 617, 69 Atl. 1116, 14 Ann. Cas. 122. Child under fourteen around dangerous machinery.

Inland Steel Co. v. Yedinak (1909), 87 N. E. 229, 172 Ind. 423, 139 Am. St. Rep. 389. Under sixteen, in manufacturing and mercantile establishments, more than ten hours a day or sixty hours a week.

State v. Rose (1910), 125 La. 462, 51 So. 496, 26 L. R. A. N. S. 821. Children under fourteen in mills, factories, etc.

Beauchamp v. Sturges (U. S. S. Ct. 1913), 250 Ill. 303, 95 N. E. 204; affirmed 34 S. Ct. 60, 231 U. S. 320, 58 L. Ed. 245, L. R. A. 1915A 1196. Children under sixteen operating certain machinery.

Green v. Appleton Woolen Mills (1916), 162 Wis. 145, 155 N. W. 958. Minors under sixteen around dangerous machinery.

Westerland v. Kettle River Co. (1917), 137 Minn. 24, 162 N. W. 680. Dangerous work. Law not unconstitutional merely because dangerous character of work is left to doubt or uncertainty.

Commonwealth v. Wormser (1918), 260 Pa. 44, 103 Atl. 500. Children under sixteen at night in factories.

Terry Dairy Co. v. Nally (1920), 225 S. W. (Ark.) 887. Children under fourteen.

State v. Collins (1924), 198 N. W. 557. Under sixteen, more than ten hours a day.

Kendall v. State (1925), 148 N. E. 367. Under fourteen, in connection with moving picture exhibits.

Kowalczyk v. Swift Co. (1928), 329 Ill. 308, 160 N. E. 588. Minor under fifteen. Law forbidding employment of minors in extrahazardous occupations not unconstitutional for failure to define dangerous employment.

State v. Erle (1930), 232 N. W. (Iowa) 279. Under fourteen, in occupation dangerous to life and injurious to morals.

5. *If the Congress legislated on the subject of child labor, it could not avoid interfering with education.*

It is somewhat puzzling to find in the long record of the debate on the child labor amendment so able a man and a lawyer as the late Senator Walsh of Montana denying that the child labor amendment had anything whatever to do with education.

Child labor and compulsory education can hardly be separated. A child compelled to go to school may not work, and child forbidden to work must either be idle or be compelled to go to school. If the Congress would legislate effectively on child labor,

it should find it necessary for example, to set up minimum standards of education, at least as to the element of time, which would amount to a partial dictation of educational policy. An opportunity and a temptation to interfere would be constantly present. It is no convincing answer to say that flagrant interference might be stopped. The very opportunity to interfere should be withheld.

6. *When child labor is prohibited and education is made compulsory beyond the requirements of good citizenship, the State is forcing a mere benefit which it has only a questionable right to do.*

"The State cannot force a benefit upon a full-grown man, of rational mind, against his will." *Tiedeman*, Op. cit., No. 52. This is true of parents, as far as the free education, and the leisure, and the cultural advantages of their children are a mere benefit to the parents. It is reasonable to hold this also true of the children themselves when education has ceased to be a necessity. "Children cannot be compelled to take instruction not essential to good citizenships." *People v. Stanley*, 255 Pac. (Colo.), 610. By what logic, then, can they be forbidden work after the completion of their essential education?

7. *Federal regulation of child labor would result in increased centralization, bureaucracy and standardization.*

There is no need of enlarging on this topic. Let this objection stand as an assertion.

IV

I shall conclude with a few more observations. It seems to me that the strongest objections to the proposed new extension of Federal power are basic. Government is not to do that which can be done by individual and private endeavor; and the larger government agency is not to do that which the smaller can do. In the United States, besides, there is a definite division of powers between the States and the Federal Government. There must be a fairly complete *failure* of parents and of the home, of schools and churches, of science and industry to guard and protect children, and there must be a real *inability* of the States to cope with the evils of child labor, before there is any warrant for Federal action. Such failure and inability cannot be shown to exist.

The objection is not so much to the aims of the advocates of

child labor legislation as to the means they propose for their ends. Have they exhausted the possibilities of persuasion? Must welfare really be imposed upon the people? Can we be legislated into goodness? Let them remember the simple precept that freedom is the rule in this land, restraint the exception; regulation is normal, prohibition and compulsion are drastic.

I have always been of opinion that American judicial doctrine on the child and on education is in the main in remarkable agreement with Christian and with Catholic doctrine. The courts have proclaimed and sustained rights that are threatened with invasion by the child labor amendment. Who is so rash as to go on record against the consistent decisions of our highest courts throughout the land? Let me suggest that the Constitution and the decisions of our supreme courts are entitled to wholesome respect. The principle of authority would seem to demand it. And if this be legalism, make the most of it!

In spite of all protestations to the contrary, the new amendment would mean a limitation of liberties. The Vth and the XIVth Amendments would not save us—certainly not save us sufficiently.

A new social order appears to be in the making. The Holy Father pleads for a reconstruction of society that would result in an order where justice to all prevailed. Not by fear of the law, not by undue force will that order be brought about here; it will be brought about only under Christian ideals and under American liberty.

If the child labor amendment should attain ratification, it will have been because of propaganda, not because of principle. And if it thus become a part of the Constitution, I venture the prediction that it will not remain fundamental law. The American people, by their recent overwhelming condemnation of Prohibition, have proven that they are in no temper to tolerate permanent tampering with their liberties.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, Grace. Proposed child labor amendment to the Constitution. *Homiletic Review*, January, 1924.

Andrews, E. and Scroggs, J. W. The child labor amendment to the Constitution of the United States. University of Oklahoma. 1924.

Bishops' Programs of social reconstruction. N. C. W. C.

- Butler, N. M. New American revolution. 20 p. New York. 1924.
- Cadwalader, T. E. Defeat the 20th amendment. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, January, 1927.
- Carrigan, T. C. The law and the American child. *Pedagogical Seminary*, June, 1911.
- Chenery, W. L. Children in politics; rights of states and rights of the children. *Century*, March, 1925.
- Congressional Digest. Historical sketch of Federal child labor legislation. February, 1923.
- Congressional Record. Debate in the Senate on the child labor amendment. May 29, 31, June 2, 1924.
- Crabtree, J. W. Dr. Pritchett, Dr. Butler and child labor. *School and Society*, November 8, 1924.
- Curoe, P. R. V. Educational attitudes and policies of organized labor. Columbia University dissertation. 1926.
- Davis, A. S. Recommendations of the White House Conference with reference to child labor; with discussions. U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Bulletins* 563:19-39. 1932.
- Encyclical of Leo XIII. On the Condition of Labor.
- Encyclical of Pius XI. On Reconstructing the Social Order.
- Forum. 20th amendment; a symposium. February, 1925.
- Frankfurter, F. Child labor and the court. *New Republic*, July 26, 1922.
- Green, Wm. Child labor: a primer for trade unions and study classes. Workers' Educational Pamphlet Series. New York. 1925.
- Johnsen, Julia E. Comp. Selected articles on child labor. Wilson Co. New York. 1925. Child labor: briefs, references, reprints. Reference Shelf, 3, No. 9. February, 1926.
- Judson, H. P. Our Federal Republic. Macmillan. 1925.
- King, J. St. C. Child labor: a blot on American civilization. *Current History*, September, 1924.
- Lischka, C. N. Limitations of the legislative power to compel education. *Catholic Educational Review*, January-April, 1929.
- Loughran, M. E. Historical development of child labor legislation in the United States. Catholic University of America. 1921.
- Martin, C. E. Shall we abolish our republican form of government? *Journal of the American Bar Association*. August, 1933.
- McGowan, R. A. Towards social justice. Paulist Press. 1933.
- Merritt, E. A. Review of the White House Conference report on child labor. *Monthly Labor Review*, June, 1932.
- National Child Labor Committee. Brass tacks on the pending child labor amendment. 1924. Child labor: selected bibliography. 1927.
- National Association of Manufacturers. Facts about child labor. 1926.
- National Education Association Journal. Disinterested testimony on the child labor amendment. February, 1925.
- New York. Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York. Child labor amendment opposed. 1925.
- Olsen, M. A. Ed. Child labor amendment. Texas University. 1925.

Phelps, E. M. Child labor. University Debaters Annual 1924-25, 1925-26.

Pritchett, H. S. Proposed child labor amendment. National Committee for Rejection of the 20th Amendment. Washington. 1924.

Ryan, J. A. The proposed child labor amendment. National Child Labor Committee. Publication 323. Also in *Catholic World*, November, 1924.

Smith, A. E. Child labor. *New Outlook*, October, 1933.

Survey. Will the codes abolish child labor? August, 1933.

Thompson, L. A. Federal control of child labor. (Bibliography) U. S. Government Printing Office. 1925.

U. S. Congress. House. Committee on the Judiciary. Child labor amendment to the Constitution of the United States; report. 1924.

House. Committee on the Judiciary. Child labor amendment; minority report. 1924.

Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. Child labor amendment; report. 1924.

U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. Child labor amendment; hearings. 1923.

U. S. Department of Labor. Children's Bureau. Publications on child labor.

Walsh, T. J. Speech on the child labor amendment. U. S. Senate, January 8, 1925.

CHARLES N. LISCHKA.

Department of Education,
National Catholic Welfare Conference.

EDUCATION AND IRISH TEACHERS IN COLONIAL MARYLAND

Maryland in the seventeenth century neglected education quite as much as manorial Virginia, and for the same fundamental reasons. Settlements were few, estates and small holdings were isolated, and population was scant and scattered. As late as 1710, there were only 42,741 souls, of whom 2,974 (1708) were Catholics and 7,945 were negroes. Two years later, the president of the Council reported a population of 46,151, of whom 8,408 were negroes, scattered over all southern Maryland on both shores of the Chesapeake.¹ Landed proprietors could hire or purchase tutors for their families, and, if Churchmen, they sent an occasional youth to English schools and late in the period to the College of William and Mary in Virginia, a reputable citadel of Anglicanism. Landed Catholics could depend to a degree upon the Jesuits who were not forgetful of their duty to teach: "It is certain that the matter of educational provisions for the children of the colonists occupied the attention of the Jesuits from the beginning. As early as 1640, when only four settlements had been formed, the question of establishing a college was discussed by the members of the Order in Maryland and their higher superiors."² They did establish a preparatory and elementary school at Newtown which was directed successively by two lay brothers Ralph Crouch and Gregory Tuberville until the death of the latter in 1684.³ Yet neither Catholic nor Protestant estated gentlemen were particularly anxious to tax themselves for the public education of children of the lower classes. Nor were planters of some consequence, and certainly their women folk, embarrassed by subscribing to records with marks in lieu of their signatures.

There was no organized education, and teachers in households were apt to be broken ministers, embryonic dominies, indentured servants, free immigrants without the physical stamina for arduous labor, and even transports.⁴ An Irish tutor would be exceed-

¹ *Archives of Maryland (Archives)* 25 (1905) 258-59. For Virginia, see Sadie Bell, *The Church, The State, and Education in Virginia* (1930).

² James Burns, C.S.C., *The Catholic School System in the U. S.*, (1908) 90.

³ B. C. Steiner, *History of Education in Maryland*, (1894) 16.

⁴ E. D. Neill, *Terra Mariae* (1867) 187 f.; Paul Wilstach, *Tidewater Maryland* (1931) 84; Jacob Frey, *Reminiscences of Baltimore* (1893) 364 f.; Oswald Tilghman, *History of Talbot County, Md.* (1915) 435 f.

ing rare, for there was little Irish immigration to Maryland during the Catholic era, and the Irish arrivals were planters and their dependents who were brought to raise tobacco rather than train youths in bookish knowledge. Nor were there many Irishmen transported during the Stuart regime save for the brief Puritan-Cromwellian interregnum. It was after the Revolution of 1689 that the enforcement of the penal laws sent Irish convicts and illicit teachers to the American plantations. Yet one could hardly expect any deep concern about education in England's Maryland frontier in view of the backwardness of schools for the English masses at home.

The Lower House of the Legislature passed a bill, in 1671, "for the founding and Erecting of a School or College within this Province for the Education of Youth in Learning and Virtue," it being ordered that the masters be qualified according to the reformed Church of England, or that there be two masters—one for Catholics and one of their own choosing for Protestants. But this tolerant arrangement failed to obtain the concurrence of the Upper House with its Catholic majority who would have the school located at St. Mary's, and the scheme came to naught.⁵ Relative to the days before the Revolution of 1689, Governor Francis Nicholson reported to the Board of Trade in London that there were only three or four Anglican clergymen while there were six or seven Jesuits, that Quakers were more numerous than Catholics and had more places of worship, and that there were few schools, "But the Jesuits and Priests had some, especially one brick one at St. Mary's." On the other hand, a local historian has written recently with veiled intolerance and little recognition of colonial difficulties that, "After the Catholic rulers had been set adrift and the colony declared itself directly responsible to the king of England, some thought was given to local education."⁶

With the final Protestant settlement, the formal establishment of the Church of England, and the organization of the royal government, the Assembly was forced to consider the establishment of schools for which Nicholson had contended when it learned that the Bishop of London was dispatching a schoolmaster (1696) at the request of local authorities. Legislative action was slow, and the master migrated to Virginia when the provincial statute

⁵ *Archives* 2 (1884) 262f.; M. P. Andrews, *History of Maryland: Province and State* (1929) 201 f.; Steiner, *op. cit.*, 15.

⁶ *Archives* 23 (1903) 80 f.; Charles J. Truitt, *Historic Salisbury* (1932) 109.

was disallowed by the crown. In 1698, Nicholson reported to the Board of Trade that the Assembly was planning a supplicatory act in the hope of being allowed to establish a school which would fit white and Indian children for the foundation at Williamsburg, Virginia. While aware of the charge on the crown of twenty pounds to send a master, he urged that, "There is often very great want, and now especially of good Clergymen and Schoolmasters in these parts of the World; and I will not venture to answer for some of their abilities, lives, and conversations."⁷ A year later, an act provided that masters of ships and others importing, by land or sea, Irish servants or negroes must pay a tax of twenty shillings per head.⁸ This was to prevent the spread of popery and to discourage the importation of Irish convicts, who were being shipped to the New World in connection with the Williamite pacification of Ireland, and to regulate the entrance of Irish indentured servants from Pennsylvania. Irish servants and tutors were probably welcomed by the tolerant Quakers of Maryland much as they were by the Friends in Pennsylvania and Delaware, and a fair percentage of these Quakers were Irish immigrants themselves.

This head tax was no doubt levied upon Daniel Dulany (1685-1753), born Delaney in Queen's County, Ireland, a kinsman of the erudite collaborator with Dean Swift, Dr. Patrick Delaney. Young Dulany after some petty escapade left Trinity College and, according to tradition, sold himself as a servant to a sea-captain bringing provisions and men to Maryland (1703). As a tutor in the family of Carter, a planter in Calvert County, he served part of his indentureship when he won the favor of Col. George Plater, former attorney general of the province, with whom he read law. Thereafter he completed his studies at Gray's Inn, London, and was admitted to the bar, of which he became one of the most successful practitioners. Yet this former indentured-tutor is best known through his son Daniel Dulany, Jr. (1722-1797), Maryland's first political lawyer on the eve of the American Revolution.⁹

There must have been some nameless tutors among indentured servants who were known as Catholics or suspected of professing

⁷ *Archives*, 19 (1899) 420 f., 447, 456, 463, 23 (1903) 80 f.; Steiner. *op. cit.* 19 f.

⁸ *Archives*, 22 (1902) 497.

⁹ *Dictionary of American Biography (D.A.B.)* 5 (1930) 498; J. D. Warfield, *The Founders of Anne Arundel and Howard Counties, Md.* (1905) 184 f.; *Maryland History Magazine* 13 (1908) 20 f.

the proscribed faith; for an enactment of 1704 to prevent the growth of "popery" sentenced to transportation any convicted "Papist or person making profession of the Popish Religion" who shall keep school or take upon themselves the "Education, Government, or Boarding of Youth." Any Catholic who employed a non-Protestant tutor was subjected to the prohibitory fine of forty shillings per day for said tutor's service. And under the penal code there was a fine of a hundred pounds for sending a youth to the English refugee colleges on the Continent.¹⁰ Yet in view of the scarcity of recorded convictions, the law may not have been rigorously enforced and large planters may have evaded the regulations by disguising tutors or sending youths away under an alias. The head-tax of twenty shillings on Irish servants was made permanent by continuous re-enactments, and, commencing with 1717, an additional tax of twenty shillings was collected on imported negroes and Irish servants for the support of public education. After 1732, Irish Protestant servants were specifically exempted from this head tax. In 1723, the Assembly passed a law to prevent the growing evils of the importation of criminals and for the more effective discovery of such persons.¹¹ Thus the Irish servant unwittingly contributed indirectly to public education, and thus the colony took steps to decrease the number of Irish servants among whom there would be tutors whose classical education was obtained in Europe or in the famous Irish hedge-schools.

The Academy at Annapolis was fully organized by 1701 "for the propagation of the Gospel and the Education of the Youth of this Province in Good Letters and Manners."¹² And while its student body was small, it must have been successful, for Governor John Hart, a native of County Cavan, a nephew of John Vesey, Protestant archbishop of Taum, and the first governor under the Protestant regime of the restored proprietors, urged that education be more diffused and that similar institutions be established in the other counties. On inquiry he had learned from the established ministers that schools were bad and that capable, approved teachers were sadly wanting. Hart may have

¹⁰ *Archives*, 26 (1906) 341; Peter Guilday, *The Life and Times of John Carroll* (1922) p. 10.

¹¹ *Archives*, 24 (1904) 41, 26 (1906) 289, 27 (1907) 371, 30 (1910) 328, 31 (1911) 143 f., 32 (1912) 21 f.; 34 (1914) 619, 27 (1917) 553, 42 (1907) 371. See, Elsie W. Clews, *Educational Legislation and Administration of the Colonial Governments* (1899) 408, 410, 425.

¹² W. D. Howell, *The Government of Kent County, Md.* (1931) 109 f.

been as anti-Catholic as his master and as intolerant as his times, but the movement for schools received his unqualified support.¹³ At any rate an act was passed under his successor, in 1723, providing that a school be set up in each county and that the selected visitors "take all proper methods for the encouraging good schoolmasters, that shall be members of the Church of England, and of pious and exemplary lives and conversations and capable of teaching well the Grammar, good writing, and Mathematics if such can conveniently be got."¹⁴

Therewith a school was established in each county under godly visitors and aided by provincial taxation. Teachers were paid twenty pounds per year and granted a house and the school farm. They must be conformists. Hours were long, seven to eleven and one to five in the summer months, with an hour off each end of the day in the winter period. Nor is there anything about vacations and holidays until the spirit of independence got hold of pupils in the pre-Revolutionary years. Nor does attendance appear to have been compulsory from the small number of pupils enrolled. The free school in Queen Anne's County there is treated in an elaborate article¹⁵ which notes some of the teachers: William Killion, who was capable of teaching writing, arithmetic, grammar, and the Latin Bible; Thomas Davis, an indentured servant who paid his passage by service as an usher; Edward Killion; Patrick Hackett; James Cosgrase, who declined his appointment; Alexander Malcolm, a minister; Daniel McKinnon; William Keane, whose sporting proclivities got him into trouble and debt; John Doherty (1765-); McGraw of Baltimore, who declined an appointment; Rev. Charles Peale, father of the portrait painter; Luther Martin, the famous lawyer; and William Rogers. Some of these masters were Irishmen, but up to the end of the Seven Years' War, when toleration became more usual with the end of the French menace and the death of Jacobite party, all teachers must have been Anglicans or so popularly regarded. The test of conformity was not so arduous that an occasional Irish Catholic may have found a saving technicality.

¹³ H. S. Spalding, S.J., *Catholic Colonial Maryland* (1931) 150 f.; J. T. Scharf, *The Chronicles of Baltimore* (1874) 222; Howell, *op. cit.* 109 f.; Steiner, *op. cit.*, 24 f.

¹⁴ *Archives*, 34 (1914) 680; Tilghman, *Talbot County*, 13 f.; Howell, *op. cit.* 109 f.; J. T. Scharf, *History of Western Maryland* (1882) I, 669 f.

¹⁵ E. H. Brown, "First Free School in Queen Anne's County," *Maryland Hist. Mag.* 6 (1911) 1-14.

Of the other schools, nothing has been written. In Arundel County, Capt. Daniel Moriartee was a visitor, and Patrick Ogilvie a teacher in the 1720's. The master of the Talbot County School, an Irishman with "the brogue upon his tongue," stole a negro and two horses and was posted with a reward of five pounds for his apprehension (1745). That these schools altogether satisfied the colony is doubtful in view of the establishment of private schools for the upper class and frequent recommendations by the Assembly that education be more widely diffused and fostered. Good teachers of Anglican views were scarce, visitors were lax, popular interest was wanting, and salaries were wretched. Indeed on the eve of the Revolution the Somerset and Worcester County Schools were merged as the Eden School and the free schools of St. Mary's, Charles and Prince George's Counties were combined to form Charlotte Hall.¹⁶

In private schools, there was a growing number of Irish teachers, some of whom were men of note. In 1737, William Killeen,¹⁷ a remarkable redemptioner, came as a tutor from County Clare to Talbot County. Three years later, he was in more free Dover, Delaware, where he taught the classics to John Dickinson with whom he rose to power as a Presbyterian, a lawyer, chief justice, and chancellor of the State. Dr. Francis Alison, a relative of the Rev. Patrick Allison of Baltimore, a native of County Donegal, and a graduate of the University of Glasgow, established himself as a teacher and Presbyterian divine in Talbot County about 1735. Later he removed to Pennsylvania, where he had a proud career as a minister and as a professor in the Academy of Philadelphia (University of Pennsylvania), winning the recognition of President Ezra Stiles of Yale College as the best classical scholar in America, especially in Greek.¹⁸

James Sterling (1701-1755), an immigrant from King's County, as a minister in Kent County (1740) probably did some teaching. For this he was well qualified as a graduate of Trinity College, a playwright in Dublin and London and as the publisher of *Poetical*

¹⁶ Elihu Riley, *The Ancient City, History of Annapolis* (1887) 97; *Archives*, 37 (1917) 222, 250; Scharf, *Western Maryland*, I, 669 f.; Steiner, *op. cit.*, 32 f., 37 f.

¹⁷ Henry C. Conrad, *History of the State of Delaware* (1908) 823, 913, 922; *Journal of the American Irish Historical Society* (J.A.I.) 25 (1926) 60; *Catholic Historical Researches*, 8 (1891) 191; *Pennsylvania Magazine*, April, 1891, p. 5.

¹⁸ *Literary Diary*, III, 174; *D.A.B.*, I (1928) 181.

Works (Dublin, 1734).¹⁹ In 1744, Samuel Finley (1715-1766) came from Ireland to lead a Presbyterian congregation in Nottingham, Cecil County, where he supplemented his living by establishing a private school in which he instructed candidates for the ministry and a number of youths, who acquired fame, as Dr. Benjamin Rush, Speaker Bayard of the House of Representatives and Governors Martin and Henry respectively of North Carolina and Maryland. Called, in 1761, to the rectorship of old Nassau (Princeton), he continued his scholarly career.²⁰ Thomas Craddock, a brother of Edward Craddock, Archbishop of Dublin, while rector of St. Thomas' Parish in Baltimore County (1745-70), kept a Latin and Greek school like an Oxford or Cambridge don, charging his protégés twenty pounds currency per year for tuition and board.²¹

Maryland was panic-stricken during King George's War and even more so during the French and Indian War: fear of the French, worry about the Acadian neutrals, suspicion of the Catholic minority, hostility to the Scots rebels in her midst, dread of the Irish arrivals whether direct from Ireland or over the Pennsylvania line, and unreasoning fear of a rise of "popery." Catholics were not to be enrolled in the militia of St. Mary's County, but to be disarmed. In 1755, a bill was introduced in the Assembly but not passed which had for its object an embargo on priests and "Irish papists" who were entering the province from Pennsylvania and Delaware.²² In 1753, the Council ordered that all schoolmasters must take the test oath in order to eliminate teachers who were suspected of being Catholics and employed by the connivance of public school visitors or manorial lords.

The records are incomplete, but the results of this oath-taking are suggestive.²³ In Dorchester County, Edward McSheky of the free school and eleven masters of private schools abjured "popery." A Catholic master left the colony; another Catholic refused the oath; and two masters concerning whom there was doubt were ordered to appear before the court. In Baltimore County, there was at least one known Catholic school. In Fred-

¹⁹ R. H. Murray, *Dublin University in the New World* (London, 1921) 91; *Dictionary of National Biography*, 53 (1898) 192.

²⁰ Steiner, *op. cit.*, 36; George Johnston, *History of Cecil County* (1881) 275 f.; *D.A.B.* 6 (1931) 391.

²¹ Scharf, *Maryland*, II, 511; Scharf, *Baltimore*, 222; Steiner, *op. cit.*, 36.

²² *Archives*, 28 (1908) 315, 340; Johnston, *Cecil County*, 202.

²³ Scharf, *Western Maryland*, I, 432; Scharf, *Baltimore*, 223; Scharf, *Maryland*, II (1879) 511; Steiner, *op. cit.*, 34.

erick County, Martin Moran was reported to have taken the oath to which four of his fellow-educators subscribed apparently without question. In Prince George's County, the masters included a minister administering the free school, Enoch Magruder's convict servant, Jeremiah Berry's indentured servant, John Hagerty's servant, Thomas Harrison, a convict, and Daniel Wallahorn's convict servant. These notes would probably be found typical of conditions in the twelve counties if materials were available. It is said that several Catholic masters fled to Pennsylvania where toleration was actually practised.

As to convicts, in general, they were not necessarily wicked men but ordinary Britishers who had fallen afoul of some of the two hundred capital laws in the rigorous criminal code and who were transported through the leniency of humane judges. They were economic misfits at home; they were political rebels in Scotland and Ireland; and they were Catholic hedge-teachers who dared teach letters and catechism to the youth of Ireland and of the Highlands.²⁴ Indeed several thousand transports and indentured persons settled in Maryland in the decade before the Revolution to the colony's advantage when recruiting its military forces for that struggle.

In 1754, a writer in the *Maryland Gazette* estimated the expenditures of a hundred Marylanders who were studying at the Philadelphia Academy, while he commented upon the capital which Catholic gentlemen must be expending upon the education of their sons in France. At the time, Governor Sharpe was urging the desirability of founding a college which the Assembly considered seriously again, in 1761, but nothing came of the project.²⁵ Catholics were in a peculiar position. Their properties were taxed double for military defense, and at the same time they were supporting sons, and even an occasional daughter, in schools located in the enemy's country. This was an indulgence permitted only in Maryland and Pennsylvania according to the governor, who was defending himself against a faint suspicion of favoring the Catholics who numbered a twelfth of the population but who controlled a far greater percentage of the colonial wealth.²⁶ Going to St. Omer's College was becoming a pious

²⁴ For Irish schools, see T. Corcoran, S.J., *Some Lists of Catholic Lay Teachers and Their Illegal Schools in the Later Penal Times* (Dublin, 1932).

²⁵ Steiner, *op. cit.*, 29 f.

²⁶ W. H. Browne, (ed.) *Correspondence of Governor Horatio Sharpe* (1888) I, 497. See, R. J. Purcell, "The Education of the Carrolls of Maryland," *Catholic Educational Review*, Dec., 1932.

custom since the Jesuit school at Bohemia Manor (1744-) provided boys with the prerequisite training.

At the end of the war, there was an increased Irish immigration, both passengers and indentured servants, among whom there must have been a number of professional tutors or partially educated men who taught until they could improve their situations by going on the land or entering business or professional life. Looking across the Potomac at Mount Vernon, there lived Walter Magowen, a tutor of the Custis children, a copyist for Colonel Washington, and later an Episcopalian minister. Patrick Parks and James Donellan were teaching (1760-) in Talbot County. James Waddel, a native of Newry who was educated in Philadelphia, taught a school at Nottingham, which patriotic Marylanders regarded as in Maryland rather than in Pennsylvania. In a list of emigrants from England to America (1773-74), there were three indentured Irish teachers for Maryland, William Griffin, Thomas McCarty, and Patrick Farrell.²⁷ A list of indentured tutors shipping direct from Ireland would be far more interesting and indubitably far more impressive in the number of names. An occasional runaway master was advertised. The *Maryland Gazette* carried a not unusual advertisement: "To be sold—a schoolmaster, an indentured servant that has got two years to serve—he is sold for no fault, anymore than we have done with him. He can learn book-keeping, and is an excellent teacher." Not a ship arrived without its quota of schoolmasters as well as weavers for sale, with the latter bringing brisker bidding. Baltimore had become a mart for the sale of indentured teachers, for J. W. Alexander writes of his grandfather going from Virginia to Baltimore to buy teachers or tutors for his family.²⁸

Jonathan Boucher, Anglican minister, tutor of Jacky Custis, and Loyalist maintained in a sermon,²⁹ written in 1773:

"I could hardly expect to gain credit were I to inform a foreigner (what you know is the fact) that in a country containing not less than half a million of souls (all of them professing

²⁷ J. C. Fitzpatrick (ed.) *The Diaries of George Washington, 1748-1799* (1925) especially I, 252; Tilghman, *Talbot County*, 435 f.; J. C. Linehan, and T. H. Murray, *Irish Schoolmasters in the American Colonies* (pamphlet, 1898) 10; emigrant lists published in the *New England Genealogical and Historical Register*, Vols. 62-66.

²⁸ *Maryland Gazette*, Feb. 17, 1774; Neill, *Terra Mariae*, 212; Wiltstach, *op. cit.*, 84; Alexander, *Forty Years' Familiar Letters* (1860) I, 325.

²⁹ *A View of the Causes and Consequences of the American Revolution*, 183 f., published in 1797 when the author was a vicar in Epsom, Surrey, England and dedicated to Washington; also quoted Steiner, *op. cit.*, 38.

the Christian religion, and a majority of them members of Church of England; living, moreover, under British laws, a people further advanced in many of the refinements of life than many large districts even of the parent State, and in general thriving if not opulent) there is yet not a single college, and only one school with an endowment adequate to the maintenance of even a common mechanic. What is still less credible is that at least two-thirds of the little education we receive are derived from instructors who are either indentured servants or transported felons. Not a ship arrives either with redemptioners or convicts in which schoolmasters are not as regularly advertised as weavers, tailors, or any other trade; with little other difference that I can hear of, excepting perhaps that the former do not usually fetch as good a price as the latter. . . . If you inquire who and what the other third are, the answer must be that in general they are aliens and in very few instances, members of the established church."

It was the fact that these schools were taught by servants, at times Irish indentured criminals and servants, and rarely by Churchmen, that brought down the wrath of divines of the Established Church upon them. It is probably this criticism to which a Catholic historian refers:

"The appalling description of the immoral conditions of these schools, as painted by the historians of the Established Church of Maryland and Virginia, needs but to be read to understand the abhorrence in which such educational masters must have been held by Catholic Maryland women."³⁰

It might be added that the training of poor girls was quite neglected save in the household arts, and that girls of the upper class were only instructed in elementary subjects and the graces of the drawing room without much improvement until the middle of the nineteenth century.

With the end of the Revolution and the definitive acceptance of religious liberty which unfortunately was restricted to Christians until 1826, Maryland was a happier place in which to dwell. This spirit of toleration was evidenced in the reorganization of the Kent County Free School as Washington College (1782) in Chestertown (1782) with Father John Lewis, superior of the Catholic clergy, as a contributor and active patron. In this school, there were no religious tests at least for students and the college did not hesitate to give Bishop Carroll an honorary degree.³¹ Two years later, Dr. Carroll, Rev. Patrick Allison, and

³⁰ Guilday, *Carroll*, 15.

³¹ J. B. McMaster, *A History of the People of the United States*, II (1885) 501; Guilday, *op. cit.*, 7.

Rev. William Smith as representatives of three influential denominations were active agents on behalf of St. John's College, Annapolis, which was established by a liberal act of the legislature providing:

"That a college, general seminary of learning, by the name of St. John's, be established on the said Western Shore, upon the following fundamental and inviolable principles, namely: first, the said college shall be founded and maintained forever upon a most liberal plan, for the benefit of youth of every religious denomination, who shall be freely admitted to equal privileges and advantages of education, and to all the literary honors of the college, according to their merits without requiring or enforcing any religious or civil test, or urging their attendance upon any particular religious worship, or service, other than what they have been educated in or have the consent or approbation of their parents or guardians to attend; nor shall any preference be given in the choice of a principal, vice-principal, or other professor, master, or tutor, in the said college on account of his particular religious profession, having regard solely to his moral character and literary abilities, and other necessary qualifications to fill the place for which he shall be chosen."³²

Again in 1786, Carroll always tolerant joined with Allison, the Presbyterian minister, and Dr. William West, the Episcopalian rector, to establish the ephemeral Baltimore Academy. Here were three men who habitually "acted in cordial cooperation for the promotion of the good of the community."³³

Despite all colonial efforts for its improvement, education, that is, especially primary schooling—remained backward until the end of the Civil War. A local editor, in 1821, commenting that in New England all children learn to read, protested: "We wish such notions as these were prevalent in Maryland. We have thousands of adult white natives of the state, that do not know a letter of the alphabet."³⁴

RICHARD J. PURCELL.

Department of History,
The Catholic University of America.

³² Riley, *Annapolis*, 208 f.

³³ Clayton C. Hall, *Baltimore: Its History and Its People* (1912) I 47; Scharf, *Baltimore*, 47; Annie L. Sioussat, *Old Baltimore* (1931) 43, 49. For a brief biography of Carroll, see R. J. Purcell in *D.A.B.*, 3 (1929) 525.

³⁴ *Niles Register*, 21:148.

PUPILS' METHODS OF SOLVING PROBLEMS IN ARITHMETIC¹

It is customary to regard problem solving in arithmetic as an activity of the higher intellectual processes. Such problem solving is frequently referred to as reasoning in arithmetic. For many years this phase of the subject was regarded as a means of providing valuable training in thinking. Many teachers and others still cling to the belief that arithmetic problem solving is especially adapted to the development of accuracy in reflective thinking. While the general disciplinary aims of the subject have been revised in accordance with current theories of transfer and allied phenomena, problem solving is still regarded as synonymous with abstract thinking. The computational activities are usually considered as specific abilities, dependent to a large extent upon memory but involving little intellectual insight except in the choice of process to be undertaken. Correlations between problem solving in arithmetic and the general cognitive factor are usually high and almost always much higher than the correlation between the general cognitive factor and any form of computational ability. The following correlations between the general factor underlying a large number of tests and the various forms of arithmetic ability illustrate such relations:

Addition670
Subtraction593
Multiplication752
Division608
Memory for a story494
Memory for sentences607
Memory for digits317
Problem solving745

The correlation between the general cognitive factor and problem solving is higher than that between general ability and any one of the four fundamental operations except multiplication. As the various forms of arithmetical ability have much higher correlations with the general factor than prevails between this factor and memory for digits, it may be inferred that memory does not constitute the most important condition of achievement in arith-

¹This is the second of a series of articles on problem solving in arithmetic.

metic. The fairly high correlation of problem solving and general ability is corroborated by various studies which tend to show that the principal determinant of problem solving performance is the same as whatever is measured by current intelligence tests. In view of these considerations, problem solving would appear to be closely associated with the higher mental processes. On the other hand, Englehart (2) found that 26 per cent of the variance in arithmetic problem solving was due to intelligence, 42 per cent to ability in computation, 34 per cent to unidentified factors while reading had a slightly negative role. The part played by intelligence is considerably smaller than is usually depicted if Englehart's results are dependable. In all probability, the roles played by these factors in problem solving vary with methods of teaching and other conditions of learning. In one study, problem solving ability had the highest correlation with general intelligence among ten tests whereas on another occasion, using the same array of tests, the correlation between problem solving and general ability was seventh. It is quite conceivable that such a variation could represent differences in problem solving activity corresponding to teaching procedures. One method might emphasize intellectual insight into the relations that the problem contain while another might concentrate upon a routine to be followed and a more or less mechanical manipulation of the numbers. Pupils' methods of procedure will vary according to their familiarity with the problems and the techniques which the instruction provides. The usual insistence of texts on methods that problem solving is essentially the perception of relations and the eduction of new relations from those understood from the statement of the problem overlooks the fact that any mental performance varies in nature with such conditions as attitudes, previous experience, and specific training.

Several studies of pupils' difficulties in problem solving indicate that pupils who are deficient in this subject employ a trial-and-error method of procedure. This would be expected from the very fact that they do not possess the information and techniques which would enable them to unravel the relations that the problem presents. Problems are puzzles to them and they become bewildered by their inability to read the problem and understand its meaning. If they succeed in reading the prob-

lem, they possess no method by which to attempt a solution. They are compelled to have recourse to some detail in the problem whose recognition suggests a procedure that they have used in other problems that contained the same feature as the one recognized. Some pupils are guided solely by the numbers that the problem contains. Stevenson (6) has reported several cases of this type of activity. While these instances represent extreme inability to attack a problem by logical methods, they occur very frequently although their existence may remain undetected by the teacher.

Stevenson gave the pupils the following problem to solve:

When John was 13 years old he received \$60.00 in equal monthly payments as spending money. How much did he receive each month?

One child said that he would get \$20.00 and when asked how she arrived at that answer, replied, "I go by fives because it is the quickest way. $5 - 10 - 15 = 20$. Another child proceeded as follows:

Boy: He would get \$40.97 because $60 - 13 = 40.97$.

Observer: Why did you subtract?

Boy: It sounds better to subtract.

Observer: \$40.97 a month looks like too much for \$60.00 a year?

Boy: $\$60.00 \times 13 = \180.00 . That makes all the more. There is just one way left—add.

Observer: What are you trying to find out?

Boy: What he got each month. You can divide by 13, can't you?

Observer: Yes.

Boy: Maybe it would come out better—with a smaller number. (Divided by 13 and was satisfied.)

"Pupils often decide from the form of a problem what process to use. Several numbers mean to add. One pupil said there were too many numbers in the problem to do anything else. In this problem, 'Joseph rode on a merry-go-round 12 times. Each time it cost him 3 cents. How much did he pay for all the rides?' One pupil multiplied because it said 'times' in the problem. A colored girl in the sixth grade described her method of solving problems as follows: 'If there are lots of numbers I adds. If there are only two numbers with lots of parts (digits) I subtracts. But if there are just two numbers and one littler than the other, it is hard, I divides if they come out even, but if they don't I multiplies.'" (6, 102)

These instances are only extreme examples of a prevalent tendency on the part of many pupils to do anything but think when endeavoring to solve problems in arithmetic. Even those who have read the problem correctly do not necessarily understand the relations. Some are unable to choose a computation process that will lead to the correct answer for a reason that they understand. Problem solving for such pupils is as much a trial-and-error activity as it would be if the problems were stated in some foreign language. What could be more of a trial-and-error method than the following?:

Problem: Chocolate bars can be bought 3 for 10 cents. How much will 12 bars cost? How many could be bought for 50 cents?

A fifth grade pupil proceeded as follows: "Let's see—3 for 10 cents—

oh, multiply first. (Wrote $\frac{12}{4}$ and reported, when questioned, that she

had obtained the 4 by dividing 12 by 3.) This is hard. 48 cents, because I've taken care of the 3. No, I haven't. This isn't quite right because 9 can be bought for 30 cents, and 3 for 10, and 3 times 30 — 30 from 48 is 18. (Wrote 10 under the 48 and added, the sum being 58.) They'd

cost 58 cents. (Wrote $\frac{30}{40}$) That would be 40; 9 cost 30 and 3 more cost

10 is 40 cents. "How many could be bought for 50 cents?" (Read from the problem.) You'll divide. (Wrote $3 \over 50$.) You could divide it two different ways. (Wrote $10 \over 50$. Then divided $3 \over 50$, the quotient being 16 with a remainder of 2.) But that's 2 over. (Divided $10 \over 50$.) That gives 5, so it isn't right because I know already that 12 can be bought for 40 cents and this says 50. The answer must be 16 and 2 over. (4, p. 203).

The amount of trial-and-error activity may vary, of course, but there seems to be a very considerable amount of it for it is the natural recourse of pupils who must produce an answer and whose skill and information do not permit them to proceed systematically. At a somewhat higher level of ability in problem solving, the activity appears to consist of identifying the problem as belonging to a certain type and of recalling a solution associated with the type that has been identified. The use of the method is an habitual activity which may involve some insight or be as devoid of insight as writing one's name. The two essential steps are the awareness that the problem belongs to a certain category and the use of a memorized procedure

which is associated with that category of problems. This general method is often used. When several problems were presented to a group of persons trained in introspection, they reported almost unanimously that they followed such a procedure. The reading of the problem at once suggested a technique of solution and this method was then applied in much the same way as though the numbers alone had been presented with directions to add or subtract as the case might be. Some methods of teaching encourage this mode of attacking problems.

Monroe (5) prepared a series of tests so arranged that the results of each of several variables could be measured separately. Some problems were stated more or less abstractly. "A statement of a problem was considered abstract if there was no reference to the activity in which it occurred. If this activity is indicated in the statement, it is called concrete. The terminology of a problem was considered technical when the terms used were those that are commonly employed by specialists in a particular field. The terminology was considered to be simple when it consisted of words and phrases in general use. A third modification in the statement was secured by introducing irrelevant data." Four separate tests were constructed with variations in the statement of the problems to test pupils' abilities under the conditions described. The four forms of the second problem are reproduced below:

SRC. Simple terminology, relevant data, and concrete.

During a sale, Smith and Company reduced the price of furnaces 20%. When the purchaser paid cash, they gave an additional 5% off the sale price. Mr. Jones bought a furnace at the sale and paid \$551 cash for it. What price did Smith and Company originally ask for the furnace?

TRC. Technical terminology, relevant data, and concrete.

Mr. Jones was allowed successive discounts of 20% and 5% on the list price of a new furnace which he bought from Smith and Company. If Mr. Jones paid \$551, what was the list price of the furnace?

SRA. Simple terminology, relevant data, and abstract.

An amount was reduced 20%. After an additional reduction of 5% of the remainder was made, the final remainder was \$551. What was the original amount?

TIA. Technical terminology, irrelevant data, and abstract.

A man borrowed \$551 for 60 days at 7% to pay a bill on which successive discounts of 20% and 5% were allowed. What was the original amount of the bill?

These tests were given to 775 sixth grade pupils, 5,902 seventh grade pupils, and 2,579 eighth grade pupils—a total of 9,256. Equivalent groups were secured by a sampling procedure.

The results showed that a technical terminology increased the difficulty of the problems considerably although there were exceptions. However, all problems were stated more or less technically in that the words and phrases possessed some distinctive meaning in arithmetic. As Monroe points out, the terminology is simple if pupils have become accustomed to it and an apparently simple terminology may be very difficult. Familiarity appears to be a far more important consideration than either simplicity or technicality. The presence of irrelevant data in a problem increases its difficulty but in some instances the differences were very small. There was practically no difference in the percentages of correct solutions for problems stated concretely and abstractly. Monroe states that the results suggest that the terminology with which pupils have become familiar in their study is the easiest for them and that this implies that, in general, pupils do little or no reflective thinking in solving arithmetic problems. "Instead, they learn to make rather fixed responses to certain types of statement. Hence, when a different form of statement is used, they make no response or an inaccurate one. There are exceptions, of course; some pupils do reason in such situations." Some supplementary facts reinforce this hypothesis and Monroe presents as his general conclusion: "Although the data of this investigation are not entirely consistent, they appear to substantiate the conclusion that a large per cent of seventh-grade pupils do not reason in attempting to solve arithmetic problems." Relatively few pupils follow the plan generally assumed to be employed in solving problems. "Instead, many of them appear to perform almost random calculations upon the numbers given. When they do solve a problem correctly, the response seems to be determined largely by habit. If the problem is stated in the terminology with which they are familiar and if there are no irrelevant data, their response is likely to be correct. On the other hand, if the problem is ex-

pressed in unfamiliar terminology, or if it is a 'new' one, relatively few pupils attempt to reason. They either do not attempt to solve it or else give an incorrect solution."

While shedding some light on the procedures of pupils in solving problems, Monroe's study deals primarily with the factors that affect the difficulty of a problem. These two considerations are related but not identical. The influence of certain factors as determinants of difficulty does not imply any specific procedure although the greater the difficulty, the more likely will it be that trial-and-error methods will be relied upon. The determinants of the difficulty of problems will be considered separately in a later article.

In an endeavor to find the extent to which critical analysis and reasoning were used by children in solving problems, Bradford presented five problems, none of which could be solved. The problems were:

1. If the distance from Arles to St. Briec is 500 miles and from Vire to St. Malo is 50 miles how far is it from St. Briec to St. Malo?
2. If three tons of sawdust weight 60 cwt., how many cwt. will there be in two tons of iron, if iron is five times as heavy as sawdust?
3. A boy is five years old and his father is 35 years old. If his uncle is 40 years old, how old will his cousin be?
4. The temperature in April thirty-two years ago was 46 degrees, twenty years ago it was 42 degrees. What was the temperature in April five years ago?
5. If Henry VIII had six wives, how many had Henry II?

Blank papers were distributed to the pupils who were told to fold them down the middle. If they thought that a problem could be solved, they were to show the working on the left side of the paper. If they thought they could not solve the problem after reading it, they were to give a reason for their inability to solve it on the right-hand side of the paper. An example was shown on the board. Four minutes were allowed for each problem. Except for Problem 2, all numerical answers were counted as incorrect. If a child realized that a solution was impossible by arithmetical methods and said so, the answer was credited as correct. Most children who did not employ arithmetical methods were able to adduce some valid, even if inadequate, reason.

The numbers of such children are shown below in the column headed "Reasons."

<i>Problem</i>	<i>Worked</i>	<i>Impossible</i>	<i>Reasons</i>	<i>Unattempted</i>
1	57%	7%	33%	3%
2	75%	—	25%	—
	(incorrect)		(correct)	
3	68%	8%	23%	1%
4	78%	5%	14%	3%
5	58%	15%	22%	5%

In no case did less than 57 per cent of the pupils supply a numerical answer to these obviously impossible problems. In two of the problems more than three-quarters of the children worked the example as though it dealt with a real situation. The fifth problem relating to the number of wives that Henry II had did not seem any more absurd to these pupils than some of the others. As the pupils were mostly twelve and thirteen years of age and in grades corresponding to our sixth and seventh grades, the results cannot be attributed to lack of experience in reading and working arithmetic problems. All the examples typify problems in textbooks and the pupils used the routine that they had learned to associate with the type problems of the texts. The numbers of pupils earning the various scores are shown below:

Number of correct answers	0	1 & 2	3, 4 & 5
Number of children	185	142	109
Scores of all pupils	42%	33%	25%
Scores of 12 year old pupils	47%	29%	24%
Scores of 13 year old pupils	40%	34%	26%

Bradford composed five additional problems similar to the first set and gave them to 263 twelve and thirteen year old children. Two hundred and thirteen pupils did not obtain even one correct answers, i.e., did not detect a single absurdity. Training produced some gain in critical ability but both these studies indicate that in these groups of pupils critical thinking is virtually non-existent. The extent to which this conclusion can be generalized to apply to pupils of the same age in other schools might be open to differences of opinion. It would be at least interesting to administer such a collection of impossible problems to pupils in various grades in American schools.

Bradford claimed that the pressure exerted by the demand "to get an answer" is mainly responsible for the mechanical manipu-

lation of numbers and the failure to penetrate the absurdity of the problem. The procedures which children employ necessarily reflect the methods used in teaching the subject. If pupils cannot use the methods that have been taught, they will have recourse to whatever means they can devise. As Bradford remarks, children of these ages are not lacking in critical ability. But suggestibility depends on ignorance and the lack of familiarity of these pupils with adequate methods of analyzing problem situations amounts to ignorance. Hence any problem that appears similar to those to which they have become accustomed will be attempted in a routine manner. The pupils are suffering from deficient training. Problem solving in arithmetic is one thing in theory and something quite different in practice. As a means of developing critical insight and thinking, problem solving cannot survive methods of teaching which are hopelessly inadequate. Hamilton (3) has called attention to the fact that many problems are really mechanical calculations and many mechanical calculations are really problems. The application of a routine procedure to some situation is not problem solving in the sense that this term is used to describe one of the forms of activity of the higher mental processes.

These data show that many pupils are using trial-and-error methods, stereotyped procedures, and outright guessing in problem solving instead of thinking and reasoning. The reliance of pupils on such inadequate methods is due to several factors. The limited ability of many pupils is an obstacle to understanding problem situations and attempting to solve them through a comprehension of the elements and relations that have been presented. In the case of many pupils there can be but little expectation that reflective thinking can be used beyond the recognition of a problem as an example of some type of activity which they have memorized. Problem solving in arithmetic does require more ability than many children possess. It may be added that the instruction in arithmetic contains material which children of very limited ability will never encounter outside of school and that teaching such problems in school results only in the development of very undesirable attitudes. Some of the blame must be attached to the emphasis laid on the production of the correct answer. When such emphasis disregards all other considerations and ignores the means by which the answer is

obtained, it defeats its own purpose. It encourages the growth of such procedures as that of considering only the numbers in a problem and disregarding the meaning.

Much of the blame must be borne by those who regard problem solving as nothing more than the formation of a multitude of specific stimulus-response bonds. This theory of learning substitutes habit for thinking. It endeavors to suppress whatever tendency there may be to imagining the situation that the problem describes and to analyzing the relations involved in the solution. Problem solving is then regarded merely as a verbalized setting for computation skill. It is inevitable that critical ability will be excluded for the very theory of learning that justifies such procedures is limited to the formation of habitual reactions. It either recognizes no other form of learning or endeavors to exclude all other forms from arithmetic problem solving. Such a psychology of learning prevails in many texts in arithmetic. While the authors might disclaim any such theory, the arrangement of the exercises and the recommended procedures clearly indicate their endeavors to reduce problem solving to the level of habit. Habits are involved but anything that is really problem solving is more than habit.

There are several methods of teaching pupils to solve problems in arithmetic. The conventional method is consistent with the theory of learning as the formation of S-R bonds and suffers from all the limitations which that theory contains. Improved methods of teaching are needed to introduce and emphasize thinking in arithmetic problem solving. This is but one instance of the need of a psychology of learning more consistent with the facts and less prejudiced by unscientific hypotheses regarding the nature of the mind and its activities.

There are many other factors responsible for the reduction of arithmetic problem solving to its present level. There is a general tendency to dispense with the assistance offered by diagnostic tests. It is only by means of such methods that sources of difficulty can be identified. The localization of difficulties is essential to effective instruction.

It is not contended that the function of teaching problem in arithmetic is to produce any general improvement in reasoning ability but some benefit may transfer from any activity and is most likely to accrue from performances in which the children

know what they are doing. The improvement of arithmetic alone demands that methods be employed which will enable pupils to discover absurdities, dismiss irrelevant data, and select the proper computation process. Under present conditions there is a great deal of problem solving but relatively little thinking.

REFERENCES

1. Bradford, E. J. G., Suggestion, Reasoning, and Arithmetic. *Forum of Education*, 3, 1925, 3-12.
2. Engelhart, M. D., The Relative Contribution of Certain Factors to Individual Differences in Arithmetical Problem Solving Ability. *Jour. of Experimental Educ.*, 1, 1932, 19-27.
3. Hamilton, E. R., Insight and Skill in Arithmetic. *Jour. of Educ. Research*, 12, 1925, 136-144.
4. John, Lenore, Difficulties in Solving Problems in Arithmetic. *Elem. School Jour.*, 31, 1930, 202-215.
5. Monroe, Walter S., How Pupils Solve Problems in Arithmetic. University of Illinois, Bureau of Educational Research, *Bulletin* No. 44, 1929. Pp. 31.
6. Stevenson, P. R., Difficulties in Problem Solving. *Jour of Educ. Research*, 11, 1925, 95-103.

T. G. FORAN.

Department of Education,
The Catholic University of America.

THE NATIONAL SURVEY OF SECONDARY EDUCATION ¹

The ideal of free public instruction in the middle schools has been cherished in this country since the dawn of its educational history. Early American history records that free tax-supported public secondary schools were established in certain localities; but the principles of education, now generally recognized, were accepted only after a bitter struggle. It required the decision of a supreme court justice to give import and full expression to this ideal. Chief Justice Cooley of Michigan in 1872 rendered a decision in the well-known "Kalamazoo Case" which included a statement that the State had the right . . . "to levy taxes upon the general public for the support of what in this State are known as high schools, and to make free by such taxation the instruction of children in other languages than the English."

Other States followed the example of Michigan, and secondary education, now made secure through public taxation, entered upon an era of development and expansion. Today there are almost 25,000 secondary schools which enroll and give instruction to over five million pupils. About one-half of the children of high school age are now attending these schools, and that is a record no other nation can approach. The expenditure of billions of dollars for buildings, equipment, and instruction is ample proof that the nation is taking its secondary schools seriously.

American secondary education is the product of aspiration rather than plan. By accident, adaptation, and compromise we have arrived at a type of school which is of heterogeneous origin. The high school has borrowed, invented, accepted, and discarded various theories and practices. Even today there is no general agreement as to the meaning of secondary education.

At present the high school is attempting to fulfill two purposes: preparation for college, and preparation for life for those who do not choose to enter college. As a consequence, the school must provide for pupils of a wide range of ability and difference of interest. Confusion has naturally resulted. College entrance requirements must be kept in mind, the while a program of vo-

¹This is the first of a series of articles on the National Survey of Secondary Education. The second will appear in the April issue of the CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL REVIEW.

cational training is carried out, and such courses, informational or otherwise, are presented, whose aim is the inculcation of social and civil ideals. The problem is not a simple one.

In the past, in order to determine whether or not the schools were fulfilling their purpose, a number of investigations and studies were undertaken. The Committee of Ten made its report in 1893 and suggested some definite changes in the organization of subject matter. Three years later the Committee on Entrance Requirements made its contribution and the College Entrance Board was organized in 1900. The reports and bulletins published by these committees and by the College Entrance Board influenced the curriculum and teaching methods.

The Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education of the National Education Association went further in the formulation of principles and practices than any previous group. Its general report and the single reports dealing with the special topics: community civics, social studies, English, music, physical education, moral values in secondary education, vocational guidance, cardinal principles, business education, mathematics, science, agriculture, part-time education, home economics, and high school buildings and grounds, were published during the period 1915-1926. That this Commission exerted much influence can be inferred from the fact that its most popular contribution, Bulletin 35, *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education*, enjoyed tremendous popularity; several million copies were published and distributed. The seven cardinal principles—(1) health, (2) command of fundamental processes, (3) worthy home membership, (4) vocation, (5) citizenship, (6) worthy use of leisure, and (7) ethical character—became, at least semi-officially, the objectives of education. In a very short time every subject in the high school curriculum attempted to justify its existence by showing how it contributed to the realization of these objectives.

Recently two foreign language studies were made. The American Classical League published its *Report of the Classical Investigation* (Princeton University Press, 1924). Its chief findings included a statement of educational values, aims, method, and content. The Coleman Report, *The Teaching of Modern Foreign Language in the United States* (The Macmillan Company, 1929), reiterated some of the principles advocated by the Committee of

Twelve and also suggested that cultural background material be included in the course of study.

These studies and investigations were primarily undertaken for the purpose of improving the secondary schools. Definite recommendations and suggestions accompanied each report. In addition to these formal studies conducted by selected groups there were many individual contributions to theory and practice.

In 1929 the Congress of the United States authorized the United States Office of Education to make a national survey of secondary education. While the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools urged that such a study be made, it was suggested that it would be wise for the Government of the United States to undertake the task because if the study were made by a private foundation it might be accused of a bias toward a special interest. \$225,000 was appropriated to carry out the work.

The survey was directed by William John Cooper, United States Commissioner of Education. Dr. Leonard V. Koos, Professor of Secondary Education in the University of Chicago, was appointed as Associate Director of the National Survey of Secondary Education. Carl A. Jessen, Specialist in Secondary Education United States Office of Education, acted as Coordinator. Three advisory groups were also named, The Board of Consultants included: H. V. Church, Superintendent, J. Sterling Morton High School, Cicero, Ill.; Ellwood P. Cubberley, Dean, School of Education, Leland Stanford University; James B. Edmonson, Dean, School of Education, University of Michigan; Charles H. Judd, Dean, School of Education, The University of Chicago; Charles R. Mann, Director, American Council on Education; A. B. Meredith, Professor of Education, School of Education, New York University; John K. Norton, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University; Joseph Roemer, Director of Instruction, Junior College Demonstration School, George Peabody College for Teachers; and William F. Russell, Dean, Teachers College, Columbia University. The Professional Committee was composed of thirty members; it consisted of teachers and administrators in the various sections of the country. The Advisory Committee of fifty-six members consisted of persons not actively engaged in educational work.

Emphasis in the National Survey of Secondary Education was placed on important newer practices and no attempt was made

to formulate any principles. In this respect it differs from the report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. The usual procedure consisted of securing general information from a large number of schools, and this inquiry was followed by a detailed study of a smaller number of schools in which these particular practices were emphasized. The Survey included four primary fields of investigation: the organization of schools and districts, the secondary school population, administrative and supervisory problems, and the curriculum. The report of the Survey, issued in 28 monographs each bound separately, is now being printed and the monographs may be secured from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. according as they are published.

A number of conference and program presentations on the Survey have occurred at some of the educational institutions. The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools has a committee under the chairmanship of President Henry C. Wriston of Lawrence College, Appleton, Wisconsin, whose responsibility is to stimulate and assist in the development of programs on the Survey within North Central Association territory.

The purpose here is to review briefly some of the monographs which may be of particular interest to teachers and administrators. Other monographs, not mentioned here, contain valuable material. Limitation of space not only prevents a complete review but also does not permit an extensive treatment. At the present writing not all monographs are available and, therefore, the grouping and selection may not represent a degree of coherence desired.

INTERPRETING THE SECONDARY SCHOOL TO THE PUBLIC ¹

In the opinion of 93 per cent of the 160 schools participating in the publicity study of the National Survey it is important that the public be informed of the needs, aims, and achievements of the schools. More than one-half of the schools reporting abandoned the campaign type of publicity and have adopted a

¹ Farley, Belmont, *Interpreting the Secondary School to the Public* (U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin 1932, No. 17, Monograph No. 16. 10 cents).

permanent and continuous program to keep patrons informed regarding schools. The junior high schools in particular have adopted publicity programs as a policy.

The publicity practices are carried out either by the city school system or by the faculty of the individual school. Three general community groups are reached: the students themselves, the faculty and school employees, and the general public. For the students there are assembly exercises, topics in courses of study, home rooms, school clubs, and school publications. For the faculty, janitors, and clerks there are meetings, printed courses of study, and bulletins. For the general public the principals participating in the study favor the school exhibit as a means of showing what the school is doing. The newspaper ranks second as a medium for publicity. Only a small number of the schools have directors of public relations. In most cases the principal assumes the duty of keeping the newspapers informed concerning school matters. In this connection, it may be noted that only 5 per cent of the schools reporting, mention that newspapers printed news which was sensational or harmful.

A popular means of keeping the public informed is the "vitalized commencement." At this exercise the students demonstrate and explain what the schools are doing. In some cases direct contacts with the home are made through the medium of bulletins and news sheets, sent out regularly. In other cases, faculty members are responsible for some type of home visitation. That parents are interested in the school, is certified by 25 per cent of the principals participating in the study, who report that practically every parent visits the school building sometime during the school year. Other means of publicity include active alumni associations, the radio, posters, billboards, parades, service to community organizations, and active participation by students and teachers in public affairs.

The study suggests that more effort be put into interpreting the school to the students not only because they, upon reaching maturity, will be called upon to support and take an active interest in the progress of education but also that they may convey to their parents and to the public an account of the achievements, needs, and aims of the school.

PROGRAMS OF GUIDANCE ²

Formal programs of guidance are not only a natural development but a real need in the secondary school. Several factors bear directly on the necessity of specific direction of pupils. First, the secondary school is the school of the adolescent. The pupil is becoming aware of new powers; he is becoming an individual; the feeling of independence is strong within him. He needs direction and he must be shown how to apply his new found freedom. Secondly, the quality of the secondary school enrollment has changed in recent years. Legislation prescribing compulsory attendance is responsible for the bringing in of individuals of lesser intellectual development, and the school must provide for these. Finally, if maladjustment is to be prevented, the student should have direction in the choices he makes. Guidance programs are necessary in systems where secondary education is differentiated. If the pupil must choose between the academic education in an unspecialized high school, and vocational training, he must be shown the opportunities for the various types of training. The time is here when guidance programs are widely regarded as a part of the school curriculum.

The principal guidance activities carried on in the secondary schools and as reported in the case studies include: instructing pupils regarding occupations, carrying on occupational research, rendering placement service, making follow-up investigations, effecting adjustments between employees and employer, visiting homes of pupils, compiling case histories of pupils, administering tests to pupils, preparing guidance bulletins, giving information to pupils in groups, holding case conferences with groups, sponsoring pupil activities, conferring with teachers and sponsors regarding individual pupils, serving on committees of teachers to develop material for try-out courses, conducting guidance clinics, and making reports of activities to administrative offices.

The report, based upon case studies conducted in several cities, discloses four types of organization to carry out the guidance program:

1. *The central guidance bureau in the city school system.*—The

² Reavis, William C., *Programs of Guidance* (U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin 1932, No. 17. Monograph No. 14, 10 cents).

director and his staff of workers constitute an independent unit in the school system and are not an integral part of any one school. The staff members visit schools as needs arise and assist the principal in the organization of the guidance program. Some schools demand greater and more extensive service than others; and, because of this unequal distribution of aid, guidance in the individual schools may suffer unless the particular school will develop its own program. Since the central bureau is a clearing house for problems of guidance, the highly specialized organization lends itself well to occupational research and the utilization of these findings in vocational guidance and placement.

2. *The central guidance organization in a city system with the individual secondary school the unit.*—Where this type of organization exists the responsibility for the guidance program is placed upon the principal and the central bureau merely renders consultant service. Guidance is integrated with education, since the qualified teachers and other members of the school staff are assigned advisory work in addition to their school tasks. Usually about one-half of their time is spent in guidance services.

3. *Centralized guidance organizations in individual schools.*—The school organization assumes full responsibility of the guidance program, and the principal becomes the director of the guidance department. This form of organization resembles the central bureau type in city systems. The director and his staff of counselors have full charge and their tasks are limited to counseling.

4. *Central guidance organization in individual schools utilizing regular officers and teachers as functionaries.*—When this type of organization is used the home-room teacher is assigned the additional task of counseling. This work is carried on under the direction of administrative officers, such as dean of boys, dean of girls, director of personnel, and the like.

Guidance programs are interpreted in a variety of ways: in some schools guidance means whatever the principal or teacher does for the pupil in the way of personal counsel or advice; in others, the term is used more specifically to include educational, vocational, personal, social, moral and the like. It would appear that the school is assuming some of the duties which are usually regarded as belonging solely to the home and the church.

ARTICULATION OF HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE.³

Adjusting the work of the secondary school to the requirements of higher education has been a problem in this country ever since the founding of Harvard College. In the *First Fruits of New England*, published in 1643, we read, "And by the side of the Colledge a fair Grammar Schoole, for the training of young schollars, and fitting them for Academic learning, that still as they are judged ripe they may be received into the Colledge of this Schoole." Thus, for three centuries colleges have passed upon the "ripeness" of students and as time went on the process became increasingly difficult and complicated, until today we have no less than thirty-six methods of admission to college.

Colleges base their selection of freshmen students upon a variety of criteria, used singly or in combination. The more popular single methods of admission are, the high school transcript, college board examinations, and examination by the institution. When a combination of criteria are employed, the transcript of high school credit together with either the principal's recommendation, college entrance board examination, or examination by institution, are most commonly used. It may be concluded that there is no such plan as "most dependable" because the schools are not agreed upon the use of any one combination.

In recent years, the higher institutions have stressed criteria which would give information regarding the personality and characteristics of the candidate: College aptitude test, personal interview, rank in high school graduating class, recommendation by persons other than the principal, intelligence test, and character rating. Certain criteria may lose favor in one institution and find it in another; e. g. since 1924, eight institutions have abandoned "examination by local institution" and during the same period twelve higher schools have adopted that plan of admission. The general trend seems to be to increase the number of methods by which students may gain admission. Frequently the old methods are retained when new ones are added.

When subjects of study are prescribed, five fields are mentioned more often than any other group. The average number of en-

³ Brammel, P. Roy, *Articulation of High School and College* (U. S. Office of Education Bulletin, 1932, No. 17, Monograph No. 10, 10 cents).

trance units required for admission in these subject fields is: English 3 units, mathematics 2 units, social studies 1.5 units, natural science 1 unit, and foreign language 2 units. These requirements also indicate the trend: English shows an increase, foreign language and mathematics a decrease, while the remaining two fields of study show no great difference between the present and previous (prior to 1924) requirements. In a few cases certain junior high school subjects are recognized or appropriate adjustments are made. Some colleges are increasing the number of commercial-industrial-vocational units acceptable for entrance on the assumption that non-academic courses offer equally satisfactory training and preparation for higher learning, and there is, therefore, no reason for discrimination.

Higher institutions of learning are recognizing the fact that adjustment subsequent to admission is very important. In order to prevent high academic mortality the schools take stock and learn more about the freshman's scholastic, economic, and social background. Various tests are administered for purposes of class-sectioning and guidance. Only a small number of schools are making any effort to determine the causes of freshman failure.

The monograph in its final statement points out the need for further study of standards of admission and "to determine what entrance criteria are most effective or what subjects should be required." The problem of articulation should be solved at its source and, therefore, "the abilities, habits, interests, characteristics, health, etc., of pupils ought to be studied during their secondary-school careers, and on the basis of determined relationships of these to subsequent scholastic success, pupils should be guided into or directed away from higher institutions."

RESEARCH IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS ⁴

What may be said of the research facilities of the secondary schools? This question is answered by presenting evidence concerning the personnel and resources of educational bureaus; the types of undertakings of research departments in city school systems and individual secondary schools, the research undertakings carried on by the individual secondary school staff mem-

⁴ Zeigel, William H. Jr., *Research in Secondary Schools* (U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin 1932, No. 17, Monograph No. 15. 10 cents).

bers (including teachers) not officially connected with research bureaus or departments and the character of the research conducted in secondary education within schools and school systems. The report is based upon the returns of research bureaus from seventy city systems and from four individual secondary schools. In addition there were sixty-eight usable replies from secondary schools which exhibited noteworthy development in the field of educational research.

An educational research bureau, according to the monograph, includes "all definitely created subdivisions of school systems which have one or more of the following functions; activities in relation to research and statistics, mental and educational measurements, child welfare and classification, experimental and research work, or any other functions, either of conducting investigations or of directing investigational activities of others."

The directors of research in a majority of the cases devote full time to the work. The educational experience ranges from four to forty-five years, the median is thirteen and five-tenths years. This experience compares favorably with that of members of the administration staff. The majority of the directors of research have a doctorate or a masters degree of comparatively recent date. (Median 7.2 years.) The average salary is \$4,000. The median salary budget of \$6,700 and \$2,000 operating budget are allowed.

Since research is merely described and not defined, so too the question, What is educational research? remains unanswered. The research bureaus perform a variety of functions ranging from, "Administer achievement and mental tests"—91.4 per cent and "answer questionnaires for the school system"—87.1 per cent to "provide adult education"—4.3 per cent and "conduct Americanization service"—1.4 per cent.

Bureaus are most frequently authorized to conduct investigations relating to standardized examinations and achievement tests and to the promotion, failure, classification, retardation and elimination of pupils. The least frequently authorized studies deal with employment service, the clerical staff, libraries, supervision of instruction, student personnel and vocational guidance.

The results of many of these investigations may never appear

beyond the confines of the research laboratory. Of the 1,116 research studies carried on 1929-1930 (50 per cent of them relating to secondary education), 586 were mimeographed, 81 were printed, and 11 were published in periodicals.

Two reasons suggest themselves for this lack of publicity. A statistical study being of interest to a particular school system, the results did not warrant publishing, or, perhaps the more logical, the operating budget did not allow for printing costs.

Coordination of research activities has not reached the stage where useless duplication of studies has been avoided. Some attempt is made by research bureaus to exchange plans of attack on a problem or the results of an investigation. State departments of education and state teachers' associations are mentioned as well qualified to carry out the program of coordination.

To date twenty-one monographs have been published. When all have been issued, they will constitute an objective portrait of secondary education in the United States. In subsequent issues of the REVIEW some of the more important studies will be reviewed.

FRANCIS JOSEPH DROBKA.

Department of Education,

The Catholic University of America.

EDUCATIONAL NOTES

FATHER FITZGERALD: DISTINGUISHED SCHOOL AUTHORITY

The Rev. William J. Fitzgerald, S.T.L., permanent rector of St. John's Church in Middletown, Connecticut, died Monday, January 22. Death was due to pneumonia, which followed a severe cold contracted several days previously. For the past few years he had been in poor health owing to a heart ailment. Funeral services were held at St. John's Church on Thursday, January 25, with the Most Rev. John J. Nilan, D.D., Bishop of the Diocese, officiating. The eulogy was pronounced by the Rev. Matthew F. Brady, pastor of St. Rita's Church in Hamden, Connecticut.

Father Fitzgerald was very widely known and highly esteemed throughout the diocese. For many years he held the position of diocesan supervisor of schools and it was largely through his efforts that the parochial school system of the State was raised to its present high standard. In educational circles, he was recognized as an authority. He was in constant demand as a speaker at the various conferences held throughout the country by Catholic educators. The syllabus of studies now followed in the parish schools of Connecticut is the fruit of his labor. His enforced retirement from school work because of failing health was deeply lamented on all sides.

The deceased was a native of Kilmoyley, Kerry, Ireland, where he was born on May 9, 1876. He was in early boyhood when his parents came to this country and settled in Waterbury, Connecticut. He received his elementary education at St. Mary's School in Waterbury, passing thence to St. Charles' College, Ellicott City, Maryland, for the pursuit of the classics. He made his studies in philosophy and theology at the Grand Seminary in Montreal, Canada, and was ordained at St. Joseph's Cathedral, Hartford, on July 26, 1904, by Bishop Tierney. Following ordination he spent two years in post-graduate work at The Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

On August 1, 1906, he was assigned as curate at the Sacred Heart Church in Bridgeport. In addition to his duties there, he acted as assistant superintendent of the parochial schools under the direction of Rev. Dr. Patrick J. McCormick. About

two years later when Dr. McCormick accepted a professorship at the Catholic University, Father Fitzgerald was given full charge of the diocesan schools. He subsequently removed his headquarters from Bridgeport to St. Thomas' Seminary in Hartford. In the Autumn of 1919 he retired from school work and was made pastor of St. Patrick's Church, Mystic. Five years later he was advanced to the pastorate of St. Mary's, Milford, and on November 7, 1931, was named permanent rector of St. John's, Middletown.

QUOTATIONS OF INTEREST

Do We Need a National Secretary of Education with a Seat in the Cabinet?

"The proposal to create a Department of Education with a Secretary in the Cabinet, with large appropriations under his control to be expended in the various states, has been before the Congress in one form or another for years. The measure is being pressed again at the present time. No other question likely to come before the Congress has greater significance for the government and for the people of the United States than this proposal. It is important for the people of the United States in the first place to understand the effect of such a measure, if enacted into law, upon the national and state governments, upon public education and upon public-school teachers themselves; and in the second place, to understand the source whence this pressure upon the Congress comes.

I

"The movement to place a Secretary of Education in the Cabinet and to give him, through appropriations from the general government, a commanding influence over public education is primarily a question of statesmanship, not of education, for the reason that the proposed arrangement would profoundly affect the structure of our government.

"The Constitution, under which we have had nearly one hundred and fifty years of national life, draws a clear line of responsibility in respect to both national and state authority. Education is a province of the state and of its local divisions. To place at the head of a division of the national government the power to subsidize, and therefore to control local education throughout

all the states of the Union is to surrender completely our conception of government. Such authority vested in the central government would be the most powerful machinery that could be devised for bending the beliefs and the convictions of all the communities to the purpose and the will of a central autocratic power. Wherever such power to educate has been entrusted to a central authority, local initiative and personal freedom have disappeared. Even religion, in a state-controlled system of education, can be bent to the purposes of the state.

"Prussia is a notable example of what happens under such a regime. Under the guiding hand of Bismarck the whole school system of Prussia became an agency for training the German youth to an ideal in which the Kaiser and the Reich became the supreme objects of national devotion. Even religion was blended in the school with blind obedience to the head of the state. War became the national ideal, and the state trained its youth to this ideal. If there be any field of human effort in which the principle of local self-government should rule, it is in the field of public education.

"A more striking example of the use of the school system to train the youth of a nation to a warlike conception of its mission is found in the Germany of today. The school system of the third Reich is being used to train the whole youth of the nation to the ideal of its war mission.

"A favorite argument put forward in behalf of the grandiose scheme for a national Secretary of Education for the United States, with a seat in the Cabinet, lies in the assertion that it is necessary to equalize educational opportunities throughout the whole country. This sentimental appeal has brought to the support of the plan some eloquent advocates in the endowed universities. The cry to equalize educational opportunity throughout the Union is a tempting plea for the educational orator.

"There is nothing in this plea. It would be both impossible and unwise to undertake to equalize educational facilities throughout the Union, and this plea entirely ignores a consideration vital to the cultural life of the country today. It is this:

"Formal education in our country in the last generation has gone through a period of inflation comparable to some of the processes of business inflation. Schools of every grade, from elementary school to the university, have sought to teach too many

subjects in a superficial and demoralizing fashion. The typical graduate of our higher schools does not write or speak his own language correctly, nor reason through the simpler processes of arithmetic, nor read good literature. What we need first of all, in every state of the Union, is a return to that ideal of teaching which shall make for simplicity, sincerity, and thoroughness. The acquiring of a sound education lies in training the habits and the powers of the mind. This is to be begun by learning a few subjects thoroughly, not by sampling many subjects. The attempt to equalize education throughout the Union would mean a continuation of the process of educational inflation in which the true aims of education are either lost or obscured and all schools are forced to the uniform type of textbook education.

"The plan to regiment education from Washington is not only contrary to the spirit and letter of our Constitution, but contrary to the fundamental conception upon which education in every state should stand, namely, sincere and thorough work by the pupil in a school provided by a self-respecting state and community.

II

"The pressure upon the Congress to create a national Department of Education, with a Secretary in the Cabinet, comes from the organized teachers and officials of the public schools themselves.

"The National Education Association of the United States was incorporated, under a special act of Congress, in 1906, to succeed the National Educational Association, incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia in 1886, which had itself succeeded the National Teachers Association, organized in 1857. These three names mark notable steps in the history and development of the organization. When the National Teachers Association was organized seventy-six years ago, the tax-supported system of schools, including the state universities, was struggling for recognition. The older colleges were then the strong centers of educational influence. The National Teachers Association brought together teachers from all educational agencies, including both colleges and secondary schools, and without distinction as to whether the teacher came from a tax-supported or an endowed institution. For many years the National Teachers Association

and its successor, the National Educational Association, remained the representative of all teachers, and its meetings constituted the most interesting forum for the discussion of educational questions. But as time went on the membership of the Association was drawn more and more from teachers and administrative officers of tax-supported schools and colleges. Its meetings were still addressed by teachers from other colleges and universities, but the Association became gradually an organ of the teachers and officers in tax-supported schools. There was no reason why such an agency should not exist and contribute in significant fashion to the progress and improvement of our public education. But gradually, as happens so frequently in all organizations, the organization ran away with the fundamental purpose for which it was created. When the Association received its special charter from Congress in 1906, it established its main office in Washington and in due time it formed a "Legislative Division" (ordinarily known in Washington as a lobby). Since that day the National Education Association of the United States, through its Legislative Division, has steadily pressed to secure legislation that would give the general government a strong hand in determining the educational programs of the various states in return for appropriations from the general government to be spent in the states under the direction of a Secretary of Education in the Cabinet.

"In 1924 the National Education Association of the United States caused to be introduced a bill known as the Sterling-Reed Bill. It might have been called with entire justice the Teachers Bonus Bill, for it included a huge grant to be available 'in public elementary and secondary schools for the partial payment of teachers' salaries.'

"So energetic was the lobby of the National Education Association of the United States in pushing this bill that no one might criticize it without being branded an enemy of the public schools. In one of its circulars the Legislative Division printed with approval this statement: 'The Sterling-Reed Education Bill in the present Congress is likely to be the test of loyalty or disloyalty to the public schools of the United States. What the attempt to land tea at the Boston docks was to England, what the Dred Scott decision was to slavery, what the sinking of the *Maine* was to Spain, what the sinking of the *Lusitania* was to

Germany, the defeat of the Education Bill is liable to be to all anti-public school interests.' The 'Education Bill' here referred to was the Sterling-Reed Bill. It carried an appropriation for one hundred million dollars 'available in public elementary and secondary schools for the partial payment of teachers' salaries'—in other words, 'adjusted compensation' for public-school teachers after the manner of the bonus bill.

"This bill was defeated, but the Legislative Division of the National Education Association has remained on the job, and the proposal to create a Secretary of Education in the Cabinet with large powers and to place in his hands moneys to be expended in the various states will appear before Congress whenever there is a prospect of its success.

"The demoralization that the passage of such legislation would work amongst the teachers of the public schools is beyond estimation. Thousands of public-school teachers would, under such a dispensation, be in hot pursuit of their congressmen. What this sort of pressure would do to the public treasury would make the advocates of the soldiers bonus seem modest in comparison.

"This is not the American conception of government or of education. Americans are not ready to surrender the ideal of liberty upon which our government was founded."—HENRY S. PRITCHETT, President-Emeritus, in the *Twenty-Eighth Annual Report of the President and of the Treasurer, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.*

SURVEY OF THE FIELD

The establishment of a child research center at the Catholic University of America, which would combine and coordinate the work and effort now being expended by several departments and instructors and result in the formation of an advisory body of recognized authorities, has been authorized by the Most Rev. James H. Ryan, rector of the university. Research in child developments have been conducted independently for several years by the Rev. Dr. J. Edward Rauth, of the Department of Psychology, and the Rev. Dr. Paul Hanly Furfey, of the Department of Sociology, but of late they have been brought into close contact by the expanding scope of their respective fields, conducting their researches and publishing the results jointly. This pooling of interests is expected to expedite work

in child studies which is in the forefront of current social problems because of conditions arising from the present economic condition of the country. All phases touching upon the problem will be included in the work of the Center and each will be represented by at least one councillor. The present set-up includes representation in the psychological, sociological, religious, clinical, institutional, pediatrial, genetical, and educational fields. The studies and work connected with the Child development Center will be carried out under the directions of Drs. Rauth and Furfey in close cooperation with the heads of the related departments in the university On April 1 the affiliated tuberculosis associations of the United States will launch a "Health Recovery Campaign" to emphasize to the public the benefits they receive from an efficient health department, and to stimulate them to demand adequate health service. The reason for this educational effort is that during the depression health departments throughout the country were not only the first to feel the axe of retrenchment, but had a deeper bite taken out of their budgets than any other municipal department. Many are today operating on dangerously low budgets. Now that reconstruction is the order of the day, persons and organizations interested in public health feel that the health department should be the first to feel its benefits The Catholic Forum under the auspices of the Toledo Teachers' College is presenting during Lent a series of five lectures in the Central Catholic High School of Toledo. The series includes: State Aid for All Free Schools by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis J. Macelwane; Catholic Principles and the New Deal by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan; The Catholic Doctrine on Birth Control by Rev. Dr. John A. O'Brien; Need There Be War? by Professor Edward J. Eggl; and The Threat in Sterilization by Rev. Vincent Kelly, S.J. . . . "Rip Van Winkle," Washington Irving's famous classic of the Catskills, will be presented at the National Theater, Washington, D. C., Saturday morning, March 10. This is the fifth play in the Children's Theater Series presented under the auspices of the Women's International League.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Psychologia, by Gerard Esser. Techny, Illinois: Society of the Divine Word, 1931. Pp. xvii+515.

This handbook is really a course in psychology for the clerics of the Society of the Divine Word at St. Mary's Seminary, Techny, Ill. The author states that psychology is a philosophical science of the soul. It is a philosophical discipline which is primarily concerned with vegetative, sensitive, and rational life. However, psychology, strictly speaking, is now restricted to the field of psychic life, consequently it is not concerned with the plant kingdom, but only with the animal kingdom, including man. Thus the writer defines psychology as the science which investigates psychical properties and operations and infers from them the nature and the ultimate causes of animals. He gives a twofold division of psychology, empirical and metaphysical. There are two principal groups of psychical functions, the lower common to all animals and the higher, the rational, proper to man. Therefore the work is divided into two books of which the first treats of sensitive psychology and the second of rational psychology.

The first part of the book must be regarded as a sort of propaedeutic to the rest of the whole volume; it simply is not philosophy, it only furnishes a foundation of facts from which ulterior inferential knowledge is sought. The second part of the first book, "On the Nature of the Sensitive Principle," is more apt to engage the attention of philosophers. Father Esser holds that this sensitive principle is a permanent substance. However, the animal soul does not subsist in itself, but in a body; therefore it ceases to exist at the death of the organism. We observe that he sides with Scotus and Suarez when he teaches that every sensitive soul is divisible. Certainly this view is preferable, for it is more in harmony with facts, especially recent facts. The animal soul originates by generation, even new species arise in this fashion; hence one need not postulate a direct intervention of the Deity to account for the appearance of a new species.

The second book is philosophy in the strict sense of the word; that is, philosophy of the mind. Here the author examines the various psychical activities which are held to be superior; namely, the rational activities of which the subject is the human soul.

We notice that Professor Esser rejects the theory of innate ideas. He is an adherent of the Aristotelian and Thomistic doctrine of the origin of the contents of consciousness through the senses. He also rejects the old theory of divine illumination of the Neoplatonists, Augustine, and Bonaventura. He refutes Ontologism and Traditionalism. He establishes the freedom of the will of man and declines to accept determinism. He advances the tenet of the substantiality of the soul, which, he admits, is generally discarded by the philosophers of today. The author upholds the unity of the soul and refuses to admit the doctrine of the plurality of forms, even successive forms, affirming that the one, simple, spiritual human soul does not originate by generation, but by God's immediate creation. This, he declares, is the *sententia communissima* of modern representatives of Scholasticism. Psycho-physical parallelism is eliminated, for the author is a protagonist of the Thomistic teaching of the human composite of two incomplete substances forming one complete substance and nature; i.e., human personality. Acknowledging the possibility of the evolution of the human body from that of some lower forms, he teaches that the same cannot be held of the human soul. The final chapter of the book treats of the destiny of man. The writer gives the classical arguments for the immortality of the soul of man and points the reasonableness of Christ's teaching of the resurrection of the body.

In conclusion we must express our appreciation of the author's efforts to give due recognition to the most recent acquisitions of the natural sciences. His is the most modern textbook of this kind which has come to our hands. The appearance of Father Esser's Psychology has rendered older treatises on this subject more or less obsolete. We venture to suggest that a carefully selected and classical bibliography would notably increase the usefulness of the manual.

J. J. ROLBIECKI.

Department of Philosophy,
The Catholic University of America.

The Wind in the Willows, by Kenneth Grahame. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933. Price, \$1.

Here is an old friend in new dress, an old friend notable because, as the years pass, it becomes more and more a classic

for children. Scribner's are asking but one dollar for this fresh and attractive edition of Kenneth Grahame's charmingly written tale of Mole, Rat, and company. Children are still fascinated by the gay and colorful adventures of the jolly fellows; adults find Grahame slyly amusing and his story a beguiling thing never overdone. The Ernest Shepard illustrations add considerably to one's enjoyment of the text; they are consistently in the spirit of the author, imaginative and distinguished.

JOHN S. KENNEDY.

Religion and Living, by Brother Ernest, C.S.C., Ph.B. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1933. Paper, pp. 107. Price, 50 cents.

Brother Ernest's book bears all the earmarks of the author's practical experience in teaching boys to *live* their religion. The reader realizes throughout that the author is not discussing theories but is recording the results of classroom experience. Hence the usefulness of the book for all teachers of religion. Would that all teachers of this most important subject would make the same effort as did the author in the beginning of every school-year to obtain first-hand information of the problems confronting his pupils. Here is his excellent method. On the second day of school, he passed out sheets of paper containing the following questions:

1. How often did you receive Holy Communion during August?
2. Why didn't you go oftener?
3. What do you consider the dominant sin in boys of your age?
4. For how long do you believe a boy of your age remains in the state of grace after a good confession?
5. What could the teacher do to make you a better Catholic?
6. Would you be ready to die in your present spiritual condition?
7. Is confession a "torture" or is it "welcomed by you"?

No signatures were to be appended to the papers, and the boys were told that, if they feared the teacher would recognize their writing, they might print the answers or even refuse to answer the questions at all. In the ten years that the author used this method of approach, he has never found any boy the least unwilling to correspond with the teacher. The tabulation of the

results brought many a surprise for the teacher. However, the students' answers suggested live topics for class discussion and revealed the reasons why our young people are not practicing their religion as they should. But once the reasons are discovered and the corresponding causes remedied, the teacher will find a most gratifying response to God's grace. For instance, the author reports excellent results from the method he describes on pages 15 to 16 for dealing with the subject of holy purity.

While so small a book could, of course, not attempt to give a complete course in religion, still there are regrettable lacunae in the treatment of the important subject of vocation. The author rightly brings up the subject, but takes too narrow a view of the field. In fact, the term vocation is used rather loosely. On page 65, vocation is used to mean one's "life-work," in the sense of one's trade or profession. The author then proceeds to give excellent advice for choosing one's trade or profession. On page 74ff., the author deals with vocation in what he calls the restricted sense of the term; namely, as referring to the priesthood or the religious life. Brother Ernest believes that, "because teachers and pupils alike are so well acquainted with the priesthood," he need give but small space to the subject, and forthwith devotes nine pages to the subject of a Brother's vocation. Though it is high time that our Brothers should come into their own and receive adequate treatment at the hands of all who touch on the matter of vocation, still the present treatment would seem to over-emphasize this particular subject. Probably less than 2 per cent of the average high school class of boys will ever become Brothers, and why should the vocation of the vast majority be ignored in the present book? Though the reviewer examined *Religion and Living* thoroughly, he found no mention at all of the subject of marriage, and this in a book intended to show how religion is to be taught to high school seniors! If this neglect of the vital subject is typical of the treatment given to marriage in our Catholic high schools, we need not be surprised at the gross ignorance of the ideals of Christian marriage that is so common among our laity.

To remedy this situation the subject of vocation should be treated adequately first in its broad sense, as the Rev. Dr. John M. Cooper does so well in the fourth volume of *Religion Outlines for Colleges* (pp. 46ff.). In this broad sense, vocation means one

of the following three callings: 1) celibacy within the priesthood or the religious life; 2) marriage; 3) single life in the world, with, commonly, some business or profession. The majority of the pupils will marry and much attention should consequently be given to the vital problem of inculcating the ideals of Christian marriage.

FELIX M. KIRSCH, O.M.Cap.

Department of Education,
The Catholic University of America.

Medal Stories, by the Daughters of Charity, St Joseph's College, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Four volumes. Lynchburg, Va.: Brown-Morrison Co.

It was the famous Catholic educationist, Joseph Kellner, who said: "Tell me a story so that I may see what kind of teacher you are." Measured by this standard, the Authors of *Medal Stories* must be excellent teachers since their stories, both in content and form, are mostly of a high order. Their stories range over a wide field in history as well as in geography, and deal with manners and customs of different nationalities and different ages in a new and fascinating way. Though the stories are, for the most part, based on fact, they still have all the charms of fairy tales. A further merit is that the stories are of the character building type in that they are chiefly based on the biographies of Catholic heroes and heroines—God's saints. Quite often, too, the stories are used effectively to teach Christian doctrine in an interesting and entertaining way. In form the technique of the modern short story is well utilized. Books One and Two have been checked by the Gates Vocabulary of Columbia University.

With all these merits, the *Medal Stories* have richly deserved the large market they have found as supplementary readers in our Catholic schools. But the present price of the books—one dollar per volume—has prevented their still wider use. To make the books available to the largest public possible, a new edition is now being prepared in seven volumes to be known as the Rainbow Edition since each of the seven groups of stories will be bound in one of the seven colors of the rainbow. This new edition will be offered for sale in all ten-cent stores throughout the United States.

Since new illustrations are to be prepared for the Rainbow Edition, we trust that the few mistakes made in the first edition will be corrected in the revision. There should be a careful check-up so that there be no contradiction between the text and the illustrations. In the present edition, for instance, in Book Two, on p. 30, the text speaks of two lions while the accompanying illustration shows only one. In the same book on p. 51, St. Boniface is described as a Bishop while the illustration presents him in a trapper's outfit, with a halo around his head. On p. 87 of Book Four there is a reference to the brown habit of the Franciscan priest, but the illustration on p. 86 depicts him as wearing a black cassock.

The text should likewise be carefully revised for the new edition. In the Preface to Book One, the authors rightly promise true stories to the little ones. Children if asked to choose between a beautiful and a true story, will invariably call for the true story. Even if they let the fairy tale pass as a true story, it is obvious that their desire to hear what is true betokens their craving for something positive, something more than a mere fable. Hence to inculcate the lesson of truth-telling, it is hardly advisable to repeat the hoary fable of George Washington's hatchet and the cherry tree, as is done on p. 57 of Book Two. Nor is it desirable to encourage our teachers to decorate the school-room windows with hatchets for George Washington's birthday as is shown in the picture facing p. 44. The story of "The Best Deed," in Book One, offers an instance of what the late Dr. Shields was wont to excoriate as "pig morality": offering a prize for a good deed. In the story the children have been told to prepare for Confirmation by doing things to please Our Lord, and the teacher concludes her appeal: "The boy or girl who does the best deed before Confirmation Day will have this beautiful statue. The day before Confirmation each one of you must bring me a little letter. In the letter you must tell me your good deed. You must not tell any one else what it is. Only God must know."

In Book Three, on p. 11, we are told that "Joseph was grey-haired, but his bride was very young. I think she was about fifteen." There is no warrant either in Scripture or in tradition for so great a discrepancy in the ages of Mary and Joseph. In the same book the Christmas tree is traced back to St. Boniface, who died in 755. However, in Vol. III of the *Catholic Encyclo-*

pedia (p. 728) Father Cyril C. Martindale, S.J., informs us that "the Christmas tree was first definitely mentioned in 1605 at Strasburg, and introduced into France and England in 1840 only."

FELIX M. KIRSCH, O.M.Cap.

Department of Education,
The Catholic University of America.

Christian Life and Worship: A Religion Text for Colleges. Rev. Gerald Ellard, S.J. Bruce Publishing Co. 1933. Pp. 379. \$2.00.

This text centers around the element of worship in religion. It is a pedagogical presentation of the full meaning of the Mystical Body and of corporate prayer. The first four chapters deal with the nature of our life in Christ. Then follow twelve chapters on natural urgings to worship, their perfection in the Christian religion, and the manner in which Christians felt their social unity through the Mass, Communion and prayer with Christ. Eleven chapters are allotted to the Sacraments, the rite of each one being given, and to the sacramentals and, finally, to the manner in which all things are united in Christ.

The illustrations and reproductions are excellent. The topics for discussion and the readings are pertinent. The format of the text is attractive. But there is no index.

The reviewer wishes to commend this book very highly. By pointing out what seem to him minor deficiencies he does not wish to detract from the general excellence of Father Ellard's work. But enthusiasm for the liturgical movement sometimes leads one to generalize too readily.

In Chapter V, when dealing with sacrifice, such phrases as "agreed by all peoples," "its universality among men," should be toned down somewhat to meet the evidence. In treating of the origin and nature of sacrifice Catholics may proceed along two lines. Either, as the Abbot Vonier suggests, they can derive their notions of sacrifice from the use which God commanded the Jews to make of it in the Old Testament, or they can deduce them from the evidence offered by anthropologists. But in showing how the Christian religion corresponds to man's natural tendencies we must be careful not to leave the impression that our faith is built on human evidence. Father Ellard seems to make much of the

universality of certain practices among all men. If so, his statements are too loose. Father W. Schmidt holds that sacrifice is not universal, though nearly so. The first form of sacrifice seems to have been the first-fruit offering, and this was very commonly made to the Supreme Being. Blood sacrifices came later, and they were by no means always connected with the idea of consciousness of guilt. Again, a code has not always followed from a creed in the history of religion. Religion and morality were not always connected. Neither is it true, as Father Ellard says (p. 194), that sacrifice always implies a banquet. There were different types of sacrifice even among the Jews.

It is questionable whether Father Ellard gives the right explanation of why sacrificial-mindedness was lost. Besides the changes in aspects of Catholic piety, we have to account for modern indifference toward religion in general, we must expose the concept of self-sufficiency.

On p. 2 the statement that the environment of our first parents "supported them without work on their part" seems to conflict with *Genesis*, ii, 15. On p. 190, did the elevation of the Host at Mass come about through a desire to "see the consecrated Species," or was it due to an effort to combat the effects of the teaching of Berengarius? On p. 212, is it historically correct to give credit to the singing of the Psalms for the conversion of Augustine rather than to St. Ambrose and to Scripture as read by Augustine? On pp. 84-85 one wonders about the advisability of making an addition of the Kingship cycle to the ecclesiastical calendar. Does not this chart throw Pentecost into the background, and, incidentally, the work of the Holy Ghost? Throughout the book the emphasis is on Christ's mediatorial office, on the worship of God through Christ. The author thereby leaves the impression of not reconciling the dominant tone of the book with the emphasis in the chart.

Aside from these minor defects the reviewer believes that no teacher of religion should be without this work. No educated Catholic should be deprived of it; no home should lack it. The style is attractive and makes easy reading. The concept of the Mystical Body is fundamental to the teaching of religion. We have all bemoaned the over-intellectualism of religion teaching. In this book the appeal is to the heart as well as to the head. Its value lies in the unity which it will put into the reader's life.

Catholic education is the attempt to train students to co-operate with grace in such a manner as to bring their abilities and their faculties to the noblest development for the glorification of God and the good of one's neighbor. This text book is both educational and Catholic. It will aid students to become Christ-minded. It is a great advance in Catholic education when a reviewer can honestly recommend a book not only as a textbook but as a superb piece of spiritual literature and as an excellent treatise on the higher aspects of Catholic education.

W. H. RUSSELL.

Department of Religion,
The Catholic University of America.

Books Received

Educational

Athearn, Walter Scott: *Dual Control of an Urban University*. Being the Report of Walter Scott Athearn as President of Butler University from July 7, 1931, to October 28, 1933. Indianapolis, Indiana: 520 Hampton Drive. Pp. 27.

Becker, C. H.: *Educational Problems in the Far East and the Near East*. University of London Institute of Education: Studies and Reports No. 1. London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford. Pp. 44. Price, \$0.80.

Calkins, Clinch, Editor: *Youth Never Comes Again*. New York: The Committee on Unemployed Youth, 450 Seventh Avenue. Pp. 71. Price, \$0.25.

Cook, Katherine M., and Reynolds, Florence E.: *The Education of Native and Minority Groups*. A Bibliography, 1923-1932. U. S. Office of Education Bulletin, 1933, No. 12. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office. Pp. 57. Price, \$0.05.

Davis, Maxine: *The Little Red School House*. What to Do? Reprinted from McCall's Magazine.

Otto, Henry J., Ph.D.: *Elementary School Organization and Administration*. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1934. Pp. xviii+652. Price, \$3.00.

Quigley, Samuel: *The Integration of Teaching and Learning*. A Syllabus of the Key-Course in the Teaching and Learning Processes. Chattanooga, Tennessee: 3420 Alta Vista Drive. Pp. 78. Price, \$0.50.

Schumacher, Rt. Rev. Msgr. M.A.: *How to Teach the Catechism*. Volume Two, Grades IV-VI; Volume Three, Grades VII-VIII. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1934. Pp. 313; 331. Price, \$2.00 each.

Swift, Fletcher Harper: *European Policies of Financing Public Educational Institutions*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press. Pp. 178. Price, \$1.75.

Umstattd, James G.: *Supply and Demand of College Teachers*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press. Pp. 41. Price, \$0.50.

Textbooks

Bradbury, Robert H., Ph.D.: *A First Book in Chemistry*. Third Edition. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1934. Pp. x+633. Price, \$1.80.

Caterina, Sister, O.P.: *Roses, Red and White and Gold*. The Rosary Mysteries Explained to Children. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1934. Pp. 32.

Cushwa, Frank W.: *An Introduction to Conrad*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc. Pp. xiv+436. Price, \$1.25.

Fox, Fred G., Ph.D.: *Grammar in Miniature*. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1934. Pp. 64. Price, \$0.20.

McCorkle, Paul, Ph.D., and Lewis, J. Arthur, M.A.: *College Physical Science*. An Orientation Course. Philadelphia: P. Blakiston's Son & Company, Inc., 1934. Pp. ix+327. Price, \$2.00.

General

Herron, Edward A.: *Life Returns to Die*. A Novel. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1934. Pp. 361. Price, \$2.00.

Vismara, Silvio, O.S.B.: *L'Apostolato Laico Di Vico Necchi*. Milano: Societa Editrice "Vita E Pensiero." Pp. 231.

Pamphlets

Pruemmer, Rev. Dominic, O.P.: *The Ethics of Birth Control*. New York: The Paulist Press, 401 West 59th Street. Pp. 24. Price, \$0.05. Quantity Prices.

Gillis, Rev. James M., C.S.P.: *The Marks of an Educated Man*. New York: The Paulist Press, 401 West 59th Street. Pp. 16. Price, \$0.05. Quantity Prices.